

Elinor E. Arick, Valley City, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

William T. Barnes, Mountain Park, Okla., in place of L. L. Bennett, resigned.

Ella Miller, Ramona, Okla., in place of A. A. Powell, removed.

OREGON

Eugene E. Mulcare, Canyon City, Oreg., in place of E. M. Hoare, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Marjorie Lowery, Boston, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Amidee T. Seese, Markleysburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Emma J. Roof, Monroeton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Harry C. Mickle, New Paris, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Esther Smith, Renton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Dennis A. Phelan, St. Marys, Pa., in place of Frank O'Neill, deceased.

Alice B. Smith, Shawnee on Delaware, Pa., in place of C. W. Callaway, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Hilda J. Gross, Doland, S. Dak., in place of A. E. Paine, retired.

Iva M. Bowen, Egan, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gustave I. Honsey, Hecla, S. Dak., in place of G. I. Honsey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

TEXAS

David F. Stamps, Dime Box, Tex., in place of D. F. Stamps. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1942.

Gorden S. Barker, Sulphur Bluff, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Vaughn M. Price, Three Rivers, Tex., in place of H. D. House, transferred.

UTAH

Edna F. Nicholls, Farmington, Utah., in place of M. J. M. Smith, resigned.

Reuben J. Peterson, Santaquin, Utah, in place of R. J. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1941.

VERMONT

Mabel M. Hemenway, Jeffersonville, Vt., in place of M. M. Hemenway. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rosa M. Stewart, Tunbridge, Vt., in place of R. M. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Timothy J. Murphy, Windsor, Vt., in place of T. J. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

VIRGINIA

Louis C. Dawson, Afton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mabel C. Harris, Gladstone, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elza S. Cave, Madison, Va., in place of A. H. Cave, deceased.

Charles G. Arey, Mount Solon, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gilbert T. Allen, Wakefield, Va., in place of L. E. Stephenson, retired.

Annie R. B. Knight, Whaleyville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

Willene M. Ratliff, Electric City, Wash., in place of O. N. Handel, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Harry E. Riddleberger, St. Albans, W. Va., in place of H. E. Riddleberger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WYOMING

John W. Powell, Superior, Wyo., in place of John Barwick, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 14 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

James Patrick McGranery to be The Assistant to the Attorney General.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Luther M. Swygert to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Edwin C. Kelton, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be president and a member of the California Debris Commission.

Col. Rufus W. Putnam, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Herbert F. Leary to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from November 1, 1943, and to continue during his assignment as commander, Eastern Sea Frontier.

RETIRED LIST

Rear Admiral Adolphus Andrews, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral when retired on November 1, 1943.

Rear Admiral Roland M. Brainard, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral when retired on November 1, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Stanley V. Buss, Vero Beach.

HAWAII

Francis Hughes, Lanikai.

LOUISIANA

Girtherine Evans Lloyd, Grambling.

MISSOURI

W. Lloyd Wiley, Crane.

Parks Bacon, El Dorado Springs.

Lewis A. Newkirk, Everton.

Cecil E. Schwartz, Hannibal.

James R. Dally, Schell City.

Ernest C. Buehler, South St. Joseph.

OKLAHOMA

Maude A. Cumming, Adair.

WASHINGTON

Jehu O. Patterson, Pullman.

John O. Mills, Woodland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal Father, from whom all blessings flow, who breathes hope into hopeless hearts and unto whom little children may come and the patriot with his victory, consider and hear us. Re-assure us that the paths we are passing are starlit and the days which sweep our country onward are true and safe. Grant that we may meet the soul of the world without blot or shame, prophesying the coming of Thy kingdom and the parliament of man.

O wondrous Saviour, whose holy feet touched the scarred earth at Bethlehem and whose spiritual impulse lives, cross the hearts of men like the shaft of a great light. Let us beware of the atrophy of victory and understand that liberty of speech, thought, and act is our eternal possession and stamped with the blood of our fathers and not to be pierced by any weapon nor withstood by any barrier. Blessed Lord, lead us to be grateful for the great mass of laboring people who are reaching the high note of patriotic devotion and service. Our privileges and opportunities are countless and we pray that Thy benefactions may be upon all like the good river of water of life whose streams are for the healing of the nations. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

OCTOBER 11, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the following committees and ask that the same be accepted: Territories, and the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Beyond the Scope of Their Authority.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. BENNETT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 12, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 12, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Cordially yours,

HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 102, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Beyond the Scope of Their Authority,

the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 323) and ask for its immediate adoption.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN B. BENNETT, of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

REPEAL OF THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REED of New York addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND, DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial concerning our former Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do this, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of inquiring as to the program for next week. Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be the call of the Consent Calendar,

which is brief, and then the further consideration, under the 5-minute rule, of the bill which will come up today.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called and there will also be considered the Bulwinkle resolution giving to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce power to investigate certain aspects of air transportation.

On Wednesday the Chinese Exclusion Act will be brought up.

On Friday—I see the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs here; if I make any observation about this which he feels should be corrected I hope he will do so—the fathers' draft bill will be brought up. I understand the report on this bill will soon be completed and filed, and if a rule is granted for the consideration of this bill, which I hope it will be, it is my intention to bring it up on Friday next.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Does not the gentleman mean Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I am sorry, but a change has been made in the program since I conferred with my distinguished friend.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. When will the bill S. 1279 be called up?

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill comes up today.

On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, which will be brief, and then, if general debate on this bill has not been concluded today, that will be finished Monday, and the bill will then be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill that is being called up today will be the order of the day until its consideration is concluded?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered in Brooklyn, N. Y., by the Reverend Joseph R. N. Maxwell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMANENT MEDICAL CORPS IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to pro-

ceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on May 27 I introduced in the House a bill (H. R. 2820) to create a permanent medical corps in the Veterans' Administration. That bill has been before the Veterans' Committee. It has not yet been reported, because we have been waiting for a report from General Hines and the Bureau of the Budget. We are short 258 doctors in the veterans' hospitals, and 500 nurses. General Hines says they are trying to get help from the Army and the Navy from time to time, but nothing has been done. In the meantime men disabled in the First World War and men disabled in the present World War are not receiving adequate attention. There is no excuse for it. I believe the committee will soon act if the Administration does not. It is an inexcusable situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE EDWARD W. CREAL

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and extend my remarks by the inclusion of a resolution passed in respect to the Honorable EDWARD W. CREAL, of Kentucky, by the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the death of EDWARD W. CREAL the House Committee on Agriculture has suffered an irreparable loss. This is no idle statement. His gentle nature, his innate sense of justice, his detestation for sham and pretext, and his ability to think clearly and express himself concisely, were the outstanding attributes of this great American. On more than one occasion I have witnessed his clear thinking and concise expression bring to our committee order out of confusion. I do not think I ever came in contact with a mind that could detect error more quickly or pierce it more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I incorporate at this point in my remarks the resolutions passed by our committee on yesterday in tribute to our former friend and colleague:

Whereas the members of the Committee on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives have learned with profound sorrow and regret of the untimely death of the Honorable EDWARD W. CREAL, a Representative in Congress from the State of Kentucky, and

Whereas the said EDWARD W. CREAL was for several years a distinguished member of this committee and by his great fidelity to duty, the calm dignity of his presence, the courtliness of his manner, the courage and impartiality of his judgment, his lovable personality and capacity for friendship, his forceful, logical, and persuasive manner of expression, his integrity and sterling traits of character,

endeared himself to every member of this committee; now, Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the death of our late and beloved colleague, our committee has lost one of its most valuable members, the country an outstanding statesman, one who was at all times inspired by a superiority of purpose and a supreme devotion to the ideals of this democracy, and each of us has suffered a deep personal sorrow; Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased and the original resolution made a part of the permanent records of this committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record regarding the splendid work done by Brig. Gen. Joseph Barzynski, commander of the United States Army Quartermaster Depot at Chicago, Ill., in his effort to secure cooperation of our American womanhood for service in the WAC, WAVES, SPARS, and Marines, and to include therein a letter he received from the Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch, D. D., archbishop of Chicago, in support of his work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein an article from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include three speeches, one delivered by Governor Dewey of New York, one by Mayor LaGuardia, and one by Mr. G. Pope, of New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes on the subject of free speech and the radio industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include certain resolutions adopted by the Poweshiek County Farm Bureau.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an address delivered by the acting dean of Cornell University, Mr. Myers, on the subject of the food shortage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

STAFF OF EXPERTS TO FOLLOW UP APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I note that the Senate has become very much interested in the appointment of a staff of experts as agents and representatives of that body to follow up appropriations and see how the money is expended.

In February of last year I introduced a similar bill for the establishment of an office of fiscal investigators as agents of the House of Representatives to follow up expenditures that are made under appropriations. I think we could save a great deal of waste, extravagance, and duplication and relieve the burden on the taxpayers of this country by the adoption of such a policy.

Several conferences were held last year, and I have the assurance of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] that hearings will shortly be held upon the measure which I introduced last year and have reintroduced in this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

DECENTRALIZING OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a statement on post-war planning by Mr. Carl

Swisher, of Jacksonville, Fla., and also a press release thereon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this afternoon, after the disposition of other matters on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield back the special order granted me for today, and I renew my request to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DR. RUHLAND

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, you will have noticed in this morning's paper that the Senate committee is suggesting that Dr. Ruhland, Health Officer of the District of Columbia, should be disposed of. Possible as it may be that unfortunate situations exist, I would like to suggest to the House that before we dispose of men who have a reputation throughout the country as being among the first in their profession, we take some of the responsibility for inadequate service. We have not given to the District sufficient funds to have an adequate service either in Gallinger Hospital or throughout the city.

I would like very much to recommend to the House a more thoughtful study of the situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENDER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the Omaha Stock Journal on Hog Ceilings Bog Down.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 162 and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Education. I have conferred with the chairmen of both committees and they are agreeable.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF APPROPRIATE ADDITIONAL NATIONAL MILITARY CEMETERIES

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WILLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

REALISM VERSUS WILD PROMISES

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BREWSTER AERONAUTICAL CORPORATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one ever dreamed of questioning the courage and determination of the men who are in the Navy or who are in the various forces by the hundreds of thousands fighting on every front.

Yesterday before the Committee on Naval Affairs I heard Under Secretary Forrestal tell the committee that because

the Navy was in dire need of planes, in spite of the fact that there was but little production at the Brewster plant, the contract was being continued in the hope of something better.

This morning I heard Assistant Secretary Bard make the most humiliating, and to my mind the most discouraging, statement that any one man could make. It was to the effect that the Navy, in spite of the fact that production at that plant is being held up by De Lorenzo and in spite of the fact that they were not getting planes which the fighting men must have, the Navy could not do anything to get production. To state the situation in different language, Assistant Secretary Bard and his political boss have surrendered to a union racketeer. Just read the record yourself.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 15 minutes and revise and extend my remarks and include certain correspondence and editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and to include in each of them an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three different subjects and include some articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

JENNIE I. WESTON

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. I have discussed this matter with the majority and minority leaders. I am making this at the request of the clerk of the Claims Committee.

First, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 3153, for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased, now pend-

ing on the Private Calendar, be recommended to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

JOHN P. VON ROSENBERG

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 533) for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

Pending that request, Mr. Speaker, I will say that the Senate has reduced the amount in the bill that was passed by the House and I am advised by the clerk of the Claims Committee and the author of the bill that the amount is satisfactory to them.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$8,972.64" and insert "\$3,772.64."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "on account of personal injuries and expenses incident thereto and."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "expenses incident thereto," and insert "on account of all property damages, medical, funeral, and other expenses incurred by the said John P. von Rosenberg and wife."

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include some observations concerning the oil situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by our former colleague, the Honorable Martin Smith, at the Leif Erickson festival.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DROP IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] extended his remarks on page 8283 of the RECORD in reference to employment in the Federal service and made some statements with reference to the fact that we had extended the working time of Government employees in 1942 and given them extra pay, but we had no decrease in employment on account of the extension of hours. When the Pay Act passed many employees were working 48 hours and most of the remainder were on a 44-hour workweek.

I am putting in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement from the Civil Service Commission bearing upon that subject which I think is interesting. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Civil Service Committee on yesterday filed an interim report, Report No. 766, indicating that there has been a reduction of 145,000 civilian employees in the War Department. I also call attention to the fact that for the first time in 3 years, in July, we had a net reduction in the number of Federal employees of 29,000; so we have reversed the trend as to civilian employment in the Government. The committee expects to continue its effort further to reduce the total of civilian employees in the Government. We have already saved on an annual basis almost a billion dollars. The House is entitled to the credit for this saving to the taxpayers, since it authorized and directed the investigation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech I made recently.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered in Baltimore last week by Mr. Carroll B. Huntress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article from the New York World-Telegram.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BATTLE OF HASTINGS, OCTOBER 14, 1066

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is one of the most important anniversaries in the history of the English-speaking race. Eight hundred and seventy-seven years ago today, October 14, 1066, the Battle of Hastings took place, at which time the English were conquered by the invading Normans. That was the last time a foreign enemy was ever able to set foot on English soil. Shakespeare says:

This royal throne of kings, this sceptred isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise,
This fortress built by Nature for herself
Against infection and the hand of war,
This happy breed of men, this little world,
This precious stone set in the silver sea,
Which serves it in the office of a wall
Or as a moat defensive to a house,
Against the envy of less happier lands,
This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this
England.

Let us hope that after this war, England, which is now our gallant ally, may enjoy those blessings Shakespeare envisioned, and that no invading foe may be able to set foot on her soil for another thousand years.

ALLOWANCES AND ALLOTMENTS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 315.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH: On page 1, line 12, after the period, insert the following: "It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs; that such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute bill as an original bill; and on page 2, line 2, after the word 'adopted' insert a comma and the words: 'and any Member may

demand a separate vote on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or the committee substitute'; and on page 2, line 3, strike out the word 'and' and insert a period; strike out the word 'the' and insert 'The'."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman from Ohio has asked me if it will be possible to consider any other amendments in lieu of the committee amendment to the bill?

Mr. SABATH. I will explain that. Under my amendment to the rule the House bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule in lieu of the Senate bill and will give Members the opportunity to offer amendments and to speak to the amendments for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Then it will be possible for the gentleman from Ohio or somebody else to offer an amendment including the Sadowski bill and have that amendment considered.

Mr. SABATH. This amendment will so permit. Now, Mr. Speaker, in further explanation of the proposed amendments to the rule, I wish to say that they are necessary by reason of the fact that the Committee on Military Affairs has not fully complied with the Ramseyer Act. There is printed in that committee's report on the bill the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 and the provisions of the Senate bill, all of which has been struck out after the enacting clause by an amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs and in lieu thereof the provisions of the House bill have been substituted.

I fully appreciate that it is the desire and purpose of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who is one of the ablest parliamentarians of the House, and who, I recollect, supported the passage of the Ramseyer Act, to give to the membership complete information on any bill proposing to amend any law or Senate bill.

The amendment which I have offered to the pending rule will waive any point of order which, by strict construction, might lie. I feel that the reason for the gentleman's position is to force committees to prepare their reports in compliance with the Ramseyer Act so that the membership might easily understand without undue study and research the changes proposed to existing law.

A further proposed amendment to the rule will give members the privilege to secure a separate vote on any amendment that might be adopted in the Committee of the Whole. This is necessary because the House bill is being substituted for the Senate bill and is really an amendment to the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment merely broadens the rule so that a separate vote may be had on any amendment to the House bill. It will be observed that instead of a "gag" rule, as so frequently charged, the amendments make it a liberal rule.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the amendment to the rule.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order an amendment to the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act and provides for 4 hours' general debate and for the consideration of the House bill under the 5-minute rule. I take it that nearly every Member is in favor of the bill.

The principal provisions of the bill are known to the membership, who have evinced great interest in this legislation. Therefore, I shall not go into a detailed explanation of the bill, leaving that to the chairman and subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, both of whom arduously worked in the preparation of the bill and explained the effect of its provisions to the Committee on Rules. They are in better position to more clearly and intelligently explain the various provisions of the bill, and I desire to compliment them on their convincing and able presentation to the Committee on Rules which brought about the prompt reporting of the rule providing for the consideration of the bill by the House.

During all of the years of my service in this House I have never observed such a general demand and plea for legislation as I have for the bill now before us proposing to amend the 1942 act. The House bill increases the allowances to the dependents. It allows:

ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

- (1) \$50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;
- (2) \$75, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, \$95 if a wife and two children, and an additional \$15 for each additional child;
- (3) \$42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and additional \$15 for each additional child;
- (4) \$50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support; \$68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional \$11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;
- (5) \$68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional \$11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;
- (6) \$42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support.

The servicemen who have large families naturally will receive a larger allowance, which I hope will be sufficient to enable them to live without too much sacrifice and deprivation of the ordinary necessities of life.

We all recognize that the cost of living has increased, which makes this legislation necessary. If there ever was a time when the wives and children of our fighting force deserved to be taken care of and properly provided for, this is the time.

The cost of living has gone up and even with the increased allowances provided this bill will not permit the dependents

to live in as decent a manner as they deserve and are entitled to.

You gentlemen who have read of the trials and tribulations of these brave and courageous men, I know, feel as I do that we cannot do too much for them and that we should relieve them of the worry as to whether their wives and children will be provided for. This bill will do just that.

There are a few who will claim that the allowances are not large enough, and there will be some who will claim that they are too large. In view of the fact that the cost of living has increased, especially in the large cities, from 40 to 60 percent, it is absolutely necessary that something be done so that the wives and children of servicemen will not be in want.

Feeling that everyone is in favor of this legislation and appreciating that everyone is familiar with the provisions of the 1942 act as well as with the committee bill now before the House, I shall not take up any more time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I yield now 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us enjoyed and appreciated the remarks of our genial friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] in regard to the many individuals here in Washington who have taken upon themselves the responsibility of feeding, clothing, and housing the world. At this particular time, thank goodness, we have not a bill before us which would take hundreds of millions of dollars to follow out the false theories, principles, and ideals of many men in high places in Washington. I unhesitatingly add, I trust that time never arrives.

As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has just stated, this bill does not deal with feeding and clothing the world but to take care of men and women who are doing an admirable and splendid job in our armed forces. We all have been home and we know that there have been many hardships placed through no fault of our servicemen upon the wives, children, and parents of those servicemen. It pleases me a great deal that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House has brought forth a bill to take care of and to provide the necessities of life for the wives, children, mothers, and fathers of our servicemen. I cannot think of one thing that would work to the detriment of our Army and Navy personnel, and there are hundreds of thousands of them, than to have their wives and families at home not receiving the necessities of life and I feel that the House of Representatives here today will overwhelmingly adopt a more liberal allowance for the dependents of our servicemen.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, we expect the fathers to go into the service.

Now, we must see to it that those fathers do not go into the service with fear and trepidation that their loved ones will not be taken care of properly. That is why this bill has been brought forth?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman that the American people want this legislation? The First World War came and there were not so many in it, after all, but today, in this terrible Second World War, almost every home in the country is touched and we realize that we should give adequate care to the dependents of our soldiers and sailors. Not only the Congress thinks that is necessary but the American people feel that way too.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts always speaks wisely.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the remarks I make will be directed at the rule and the bill, and not at the merits of the bill.

In the first place, there seems to be some misunderstanding as to just what the procedure will be under the amended rule. Under this rule, the committee amendment, or the committee substitute, which begins on page 11 of the bill (S. 1279) will be read as an original bill. It is an open rule as to that bill or substitute. Any germane amendment will be in order.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. When we reach the consideration of the substitute, it will take the place of the original bill?

Mr. MICHENER. When the Clerk begins to read for amendment under the 5-minute rule he will begin on page 11, which is the substitute bill. The substitute bill then will be read as if it were the original bill and perfected. After all amendments offered to the substitute bill have been voted on, there will then be a vote as between the Senate bill and the substitute bill. In other words, the question will be, Shall the committee bill be accepted as a substitute for the Senate bill? If the committee substitute is accepted, then the House is through with the consideration under the 5-minute rule and the Committee rises. If the motion is voted down, then the Senate bill, through which the lines are drawn in the print before us, will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule just the same as if there had been no committee substitute proposed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. As to the rule, the gentleman is right, and he has explained it thoroughly with this exception. We will consider the committee bill under the 5-minute rule. If any amendments are adopted on the floor and the bill is reported with the amendments to the House bill and a vote is taken and the bill is approved, naturally it will take the place of the Senate bill. Is not that right?

Mr. MICHENER. I think I probably used clumsy language. I am glad the chairman in his usual lucid way has made the matter clear. He is quite right.

Mr. ROESION of Kentucky. If the gentleman will yield further, if the House substitute is adopted in Committee, then there will be no consideration of the Senate bill, will there? The Senate bill will not be read and there will be no right to amend it.

Mr. MICHENER. The Senate bill will not be read, provided the committee substitute when perfected is adopted as a substitute for the Senate bill. I cannot make it plainer.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I propose to offer some amendments to the bill reported by the House committee. Let me get this procedure straight. The gentleman says that under the 5-minute rule, if we move to adopt the House bill as a substitute to the Senate bill, that will not bar me from offering my amendments to the House bill?

Mr. MICHENER. I think I can answer the gentleman's question. As I recall, the gentleman has a bill dealing with the same subject pending in the House.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman from Michigan desires to have that bill considered in lieu of the committee substitute bill, his procedure would be, upon the completion of the reading of the first section of the committee substitute, to offer his bill as an amendment to the first section and give notice that if his amendment prevails he will move to strike out each subsequent section of the House substitute as they are read.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is not exactly what I wanted to do. I would rather have the provisions of my bill offered as amendments to increase the allowances in the House bill. They will be in the form of three amendments.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman will have the same privilege to amend the committee substitute as he has to amend any bill under the general rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is what I wanted to have understood.

Mr. MICHENER. Now just one other thing. I call the attention of the Military Affairs Committee in particular, and of the House in general, to the man-

ner in which this bill is drafted. I have called attention to this practice on numerous occasions and the condition has been remedied by most committees. To illustrate what I mean, section 2 of the committee substitute reads:

That section 102 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words "except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof."

Therefore, if this bill is enacted said section 2 will be written in the statute books of the United States as a law.

The reader of the law will be confronted with a formula which he must follow. By the process of elimination and addition of commas, periods, and words to an existing law, he will be able to find out what the Congress intended when it enacted said section 2. In no other way will he be able to know what the law is.

In short, section 2 suggests what should be done to existing law to give expression to the intent of Congress. Each individual seeking to know the law must perform a mechanical operation before he knows. If he makes no mistakes, and eliminates the intended periods and commas and inserts the additional words in the proper places, then he can feel that he knows what the law is. This is ridiculous, is it not? We all know it should not be. I have faith enough in the good sense of this House to believe that it will remedy this situation before a final vote is taken on this bill.

The next section in the substitute reads as follows:

Sec. 3. That section 103 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man"—

And so forth. That is as it should be, because anyone reading section 3 of this bill will know exactly how section 103, as amended, will read, and how it will appear in the statute.

Imagine your constituent asking you for a copy of this law after it is enacted. You send over to the Document Room and get a copy of the public law and send it to him. If he happens to be a lawyer and happens to have the United States Statutes handy, he may be able to figure out just what section 2 means. If he were not so qualified and equipped, he would be compelled to seek the advice of a lawyer who has a set of the United States Statutes. Things like this should not happen, and the House is entitled to nothing but censure if it permits such a thing to transpire.

Then again, imagine a judge on the bench trying a case where this law is involved. The judge asks the attorney for a copy of the statute, and the attorney hands him up the law embodying section 2 as above quoted. The judge must then get the original law, superimpose the amendatory statute upon the original statute and, if he makes no mistakes in the process, he will then know what the law is about which he has inquired. Such procedure is inexcusable, if not asinine. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this committee substitute must be amended before it leaves the House.

This strike-out-and-insert practice became prevalent a few years ago when legislation was being drafted in the departments and agencies by inexperienced draftsmen. Possibly they are not to blame, because they drew up in bill form the changes they desired to make in existing law. They wrote the formula and expected the Congress to do the mechanical work before the law reached the books. The Congress in many cases simply approved the bills sent up to it without any changes whatever and, as a result, we find upon the books today some of this type of legislation. Maybe there was some excuse at a time when "must" legislation was the order of the day, and when bills were passed after reading by the clerk, before they were ever presented to the House in print. Whatever the excuse was in the beginning, it does not exist today.

In the first instance, this criticism should be leveled at any committee reporting a bill in this language. In the second place, the House is not only entitled to criticism but condemnation if it passes any such unintelligible statute.

When the substitute bill is read under the 5-minute rule I am going to offer amendments. On page 21 of the committee report you will notice that in one column is printed the law as it now is and in the second column is printed the law as it will read if amended. For instance, when we get to section 2, instead of saying that we strike out a comma, and then hunt up two or three other lines and find a period or something, and then do something more, I am going to move that section 102 of this bill be amended to read as follows, and then include section 102 in full as it appears in the second column of the report.

I shall offer succeeding amendments to every section in the substitute where this improper method of draftsmanship obtains. These remarks may appear rather technical, but I have attempted to point out to the Military Affairs Committee just what we all realize should be done, and I hope that the chairman of the committee will offer these perfecting amendments as committee amendments, and that we may send an understandable and well-drawn bill to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I favor the principle embodied in this bill. I am in sympathy with its objectives, and these remarks are made in a spirit of helpfulness and cooperation. I feel sure that the Military Affairs Committee will so accept them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] have explained this rule so lucidly that I am sure it would be a waste of time to discuss it any further. I am sure everyone is in favor of the adoption of the rule. I shall use this opportunity to call to the attention of the House a matter in connection

with the law concerning our Military Establishment, which is very badly in need of correction. In 1940 before the beginning of the war, when the Army was smaller and we had too many Army officers and that prevented the younger men from coming up through promotion, we enacted a law that required the compulsory retirement of officers at the age of 60 years. That law is still on the statute books, and today in this critical situation with respect to manpower we are retiring some 900 experienced officers, men who have been educated by the Government at great expense, who have gained knowledge and information in the conduct of war through the World War, and through the present war. We are doing the utterly silly thing of retiring those men on three-quarters pay, and bringing back here to desks, men necessarily who are available for the front line. Is not that a condition that this Congress ought to do something about? I have in mind, for instance, an officer at West Point, who is engaged in teaching young men. God knows he must have had experience and knowledge that would make him a useful man at that place, and yet because of the mere fact that he has become 60 years of age this Congress says that he is disqualified, and is officially dead. As I look around me I wonder how many of us are officially dead and thoroughly debilitated under the rule that we have laid down for the Army. I see the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished dean of the House on his feet, and he is an excellent example of what I have in mind.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Only this morning my attention was called to a man who has been in the service for 34 or 35 years, who is a graduate of West Point, but he has been released because of his age, when he looks younger than 50 years, and his father and mother are still living. Yet he has been retired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am very glad to know that the gentleman from Illinois agrees with me on this very obvious situation, and I hope that he will do something to help me get it corrected. I have in my pocket a copy of the order retiring one of these men, a man with a splendid, a distinguished record. What does the order say? That order says that under the mandate of statutory law, "To our deep regret we are required to retire you," so that he may sit on his front porch while men of less ability will fight this war. This situation is properly laid at the door of Congress, because Congress passed the law and has not changed it.

Mr. MAY rose.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am going to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in a moment, but I hope the gentleman does not think that I have reference to him when I referred to the fact that by action of his committee all men over 60 years of age are of no further use to their country, and are officially dead.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Of course the gentleman from Virginia knows that the House Military Affairs Committee is no more responsible for that statute that authorizes the retirement of colonels at the age of 60 years than is the House of Representatives, but I think the gentleman is entitled to an explanation from the committee of what steps we took or what we tried to do to prevent it, when we found that there would be this retirement as of the first day of October, when only 15 days before that time we were assembled here. We found we could not have time to enact an amendment to the retirement law to prohibit their discharge during the emergency, and we had the Chief of the Personnel Section of the Army before the committee and had extended hearings in an effort to prevent this.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The Congress did this thing and the Congress can correct it. The reason I have obtained this time is not to hear myself talk, but we have here a bill affecting the military establishment, and I propose under the 5-minute rule to offer an amendment to suspend the operation of that utterly ridiculous, yes, tragic law, as it now exists. I propose to offer an amendment that will suspend that law and give to the Secretary of War the discretion to keep men in the service who are virile and active and experienced and available for the war effort. I am afraid that somebody may rise and say that it is not in order on this bill but I hope that will not occur, because, as I said before, the War Department says that this is the fault of the Congress.

The Congress has got an opportunity at this time without further delay to change the law and stop this utterly ridiculous situation.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I will say to the gentleman that I am fully in accord with what the gentleman has just said. In fact, I have gone so far as to prepare and introduce a bill several months ago that would cover that particular subject and give the War Department more discretion in the retirement, waiving the age limit. The War Department has rendered an unfavorable report on that bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But they still say the Congress is responsible for it, and of course Congress is responsible.

Mr. BROOKS. If it is ever passed it must be passed in face of the opposition of the War Department.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, why not? The War Department is every day issuing these orders saying that they regret that they have to do this but that Congress makes them do it by statutory law.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think we should give a little explanation to show that any statement that the War Department has got to do it, is not accurate, for this reason: This law was passed in 1940,

I happened to be a member of the subcommittee that drew up the law. We made it mandatory in peacetime to retire colonels at the age of 60, brigadier generals at the age of 62 and major generals at the age of 64, in order to give an even and steady flow to our officer personnel, and to prevent a recurrence of the hump such as we had following the World War. That applied to peacetime and that remained in effect until we got into war. One of the very first acts that was reported out of our committee and was passed in this House gave to the Secretary of War the right to call in any retired officer that he wanted to or to retain on active duty any officer who had reached the age limit.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To demonstrate the fact that the War Department does not have to retire them under a mandate of Congress but can now exercise its discretion, let me say that out of 900 officers who reached the age limit, the War Department actually kept on active duty 267 of them.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know anything about that, but I know that is the official order, and I am going to read from it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want the gentleman to understand I was not questioning him at all.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I understand; but I think it should be straightened out in the debate. I will read from this order:

By order of the Secretary of War, and pursuant to the requirements of statutory law, the following named officers of this command are relieved.

Now, what does the Navy do? The Navy does not do that. The Navy has called back into active service every capable and qualified retired man that they can get. They do not retire them, as I understand, when they are physically and mentally able to perform their duties.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] largely presented the thought I wanted to ask you about. My information was that while they had to retire them, yet they had a right to call them back, and had called them back.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know of instances where they are not doing it. If they do not have to do it, then we ought to pass a law that would compel them to do it at this particular time when we need every man that we can possibly get.

[From the Army and Navy Register of August 21, 1943]

ARMY RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Almost simultaneously official releases show that approximately 900 efficient, overage retired officers, actually performing duties of great responsibility, will be placed on inactive duty, while thousands of officers are being promoted, ordered to active duty, and newly appointed, with several hundred more in sight next week.

The economic unsoundness of wholesale retirement and promotion is apparent when it is understood that the 900 officers already are on the retired list because of an average of over 30 years' active service or physical disability, disqualifying them for field duty, though still permitting them to perform limited administrative duty at a desk in an efficient manner because of their long years of technical training. At the outbreak of the war these experienced administrators were recalled to active duty at the relatively small additional cost to the taxpayer of the difference between their active-duty pay and retired pay. When these officers are returned to retired status, they will resume their retired pay and will be replaced by other officers, many years their junior in age and training, who will get the full duty pay of the positions vacated by this retirement.

It requires no imagination to foresee what action would be taken by the directors of a corporation on a proposal to place on one-half-pay pension keymen, shop foremen, and managers of 25-40 years' service solely on the basis of age and replace them with men of 10-75 percent of service at the same active pay in the midst of contracts quadrupling the corporation's business.

The Army policy in regard to utilizing retired officers is radically different from the sound economic position taken by the Navy. The Navy has consistently called to active service every retired officer, without regard to age, who could competently fulfill the duties and responsibilities of an administrative job. Naval officers over 70 years of age are reported performing highly satisfactory duties, so that the retired pay roll in the Navy is confined mostly to the infirm, bedridden, and crippled personnel. The recent Army orders force on to inactive-duty status practically every regular retired officer over 60 years of age in the grade of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel, sweeping about 900 officers out of offices and administrative positions they are now handling and placing them again on the retired pay roll. Further, these 900 retired officers represent only that part of the overage retired Regular Army officers able to do limited administrative duty in an efficient manner who were fortunate enough to secure active duty since Pearl Harbor. Many others of overage officers, experts in their line, never succeeded in their ambition to be returned to active duty. Positions these retired officers might have filled successfully were filled by citizen soldiers of much less technical training, who were withdrawn from civilian war effort activities, at considerable cost to business establishments, to add avoidable cost to the Army pay roll.

It would appear an elementary economic principle that every retired officer capable of doing an administrative job efficiently should be detailed on that job instead of making further drain on civilian manpower and adding additional expense to the Army pay roll. In its last analysis this is purely a question of getting a technical job done at the least expense to the taxpayer, since there is no question that these retired officers are handling their administrative jobs in a competent manner, since the positions vacated include scores of post commanders of large posts, staff officers at the heads of important supply branches, commanders of depots handling hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property, and chief of staffs of service commands, all of whom were elected for their positions because of their long training.

At times such as these, it would appear that officers with a background of training, understanding, judgment, and foresight would be more readily found among the older officers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and

extend the remarks I have made and include therein an editorial from the Army and Navy Register.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made previously on the same resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the Appendix a very important article entitled "Airways For Peace," written by Mr. Edward Warner, vice chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the current issue of Foreign Affairs. I have a printer's estimate and it is estimated it will require \$157.50 to print the article.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the matter may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There was no objection.

ALLOWANCES AND ALLOTMENTS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, apparently there is no opposition to the rule as amended.

If I understand the rule correctly, we will be given an opportunity to vote for one of three proposals, the House committee bill, the bill that passed the Senate, and the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI]. It seems to me that the amounts carried in the House bill are inadequate in some parts of the country. I do not think anybody can deny that it costs a great deal more to live in the colder parts of the country than it does in the warm and sunny South. We have recognized that in previous legislation. I had hoped that the committee might recognize that in the bill that they reported out. However, inasmuch as that has not been done, it seems to me that the only way we can adequately provide for the wives and dependents of the men in the Army and the Navy is to vote for the higher amounts in the three proposals that will be before us.

I hope those amounts will be continued for some time after the war, or at least that the men will be kept in the service until such time as they can find employment. That is a problem that this House will have to deal with and should deal with in the very near future. So that these men will know that when they come back here we will not repeat the performance we went through in 1919, and discharge men from the Army and Navy on Thursday and require them to go to work the following Monday if they were going to eat the second week they were home.

We can save millions of dollars that will have to be paid out in future pensions and compensation if we will now take time to provide a reasonable time for the men who come back from the fighting fronts to rehabilitate them-

selves, to make the very difficult adjustments that are necessary when a man leaves the turmoil and excitement of combat and comes back to the quiet of civilian life, quiet of their own communities. There is hardly a Member of this House but who could testify that they have seen men come back after the last war apparently in good health, but because of the necessity of getting back into the tremendous competition of earning a living for themselves and their families, many men, who otherwise would not have broken down, broke down, suffered mental and nervous disorders, and many of them have been on the pension rolls for the last 25 years who, in the opinion of competent psychiatrists, would not have broken down if they had been given 3 or 4 months in which to make this readjustment.

Mr. Speaker, those who lived through that experience can realize the tremendous nervous strain involved in the adjustments that must be made at the end of the present war.

When we passed the Selective Service Act this House itself included a provision which made it mandatory for the War and Navy Departments to give each of these men at time of discharge who had been hospitalized or wounded while in service a statement showing wounds, of any, and showing all periods of hospitalization. Unfortunately—I say unfortunately advisedly—the Seventy-seventh Congress repealed that provision, so today it is no longer mandatory for the Departments to issue such a statement.

I am convinced that it was a mistake to repeal that provision of the selective-service law. It was a law under which men who came back and who had filed claims for compensation for disabilities incurred in the service only to be confronted by a statement by the Veterans' Administration that the A. G. O. records showed no hospitalization.

I recall the War Department gave as a reason for recommending the repeal of that law the fact that it involved handling a lot of papers; not a very good reason, in my opinion. Another reason given was that in many cases, in the opinion of psychiatrists, it is not wise to tell a patient just what his disability really amounts to or to reveal the diagnosis. There was nothing in the amendment that made it mandatory upon the War Department to make known to the patient his diagnosis. It was merely a statement showing that he had been hospitalized on such and such a date, which would be adequate for the purpose, so that later on the Veterans' Administration or the Adjutant General's Office would not be faced with that certificate given to the man when he was discharged and came back, as they did many times after the last war, and find the man was not hospitalized.

Many cases could be cited to prove that this contention is sound and I hope the Military Affairs Committee, in spite of the fact that the Seventy-seventh Congress repealed that section of the Selective Service Act, will, in the near future, give further consideration to it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and am grateful to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] for call-

ing attention to the manner in which section 2 has been drafted. I think the admonition or suggestion or advice he has given to the House is timely. Many committees, not only the Military Affairs Committee, are a little reckless as to complying with the Ramseyer rule. The Ramseyer rule provides that the committee shall set forth, not only the difference between the two bills, but also how the final bill should read.

I realize, and I address myself to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and he realizes that the Military Affairs Committee has been an extremely busy committee. It has had many, many important bills that it was obliged to consider and report, and, therefore, I hope that he will not feel too strongly concerning this omission.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. In just a moment. However, I will join with him in the amendment that he states he will offer, because it will make clearer to everyone what the amendment means as it is written instead of the present amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I am sure the House will accept the apology from the Military Affairs Committee made by the distinguished dean of the House. I agree with the gentleman that there are splendid lawyers on the Military Affairs Committee, some of them are good draftsmen, and certainly they should not permit a bill to come before the House in the manner in which this bill is drawn.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. In just a moment. And furthermore I apologize to the House, as a member of the Rules Committee, for voting for the rule which brings this bill up for consideration in its present form.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. Under the Ramseyer rule there are two ways of reporting such a bill: First to set out in parallel columns the sections of the bill and the law it amends; the other is to include the changes in italics. If the gentleman wants to raise a point of order he has the right to.

Mr. SABATH. The only thing that was not printed in the report is the Senate bill; that is the only thing that was omitted.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. My remarks had reference to the draftsmanship of the bill, but so far as the report is concerned it does not comply with the Ramseyer rule, first, because it prints the substitute in parallel columns with the law and not the Senate bill which should have been printed; and in the second place it does not carry out the purpose of the Ramseyer rule which is to present a visual picture by the use of italics, roman let-

ters, and parentheses so that Members may see at a glance what changes are contemplated by the amendments.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I desire to say I am perfectly satisfied that the Committee on Military Affairs has done a splendid job. They naturally did not print the Senate bill, but I congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on the able manner in which he presented the matter before the Committee on Rules. He is a man well informed on this as, indeed, he is always on any legislation that is entrusted to him. I hope, therefore, that anything I have said will not be taken by either him or the committee as a criticism; it merely called attention to a slight omission.

I did not explain the bill because I knew the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Alabama could do it so much better, so much clearer, and so much abler than I. I have made my remarks short and not gone into the merits of the bill as I generally do.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House, pursuant to House Resolution 315, resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is nobody on the floor of this House, in fact nobody in Congress, who does not want to do all possible under the circumstances to take care of the dependents of servicemen while these men are fighting the battles of our country. I am certain I do not want to do anything that would in the slightest degree bring hardship or injustice to any dependent of any man in our fighting forces; at the same time in the consideration of legislation of this character under existing circumstances and conditions I think we ought to move with extreme caution, exercise sound discretion, and not allow ourselves to be persuaded into doing something unreasonable on account of our feeling of sympathy for those who are dependent upon our fighting men. I should like briefly to state the parliamentary situa-

tion with respect to this legislation. It is this: The Senate of the United States passed this bill originally, S. 1279, and it was sent to the House, I believe, on the day Congress recessed, and therefore the House committee could not reach it until after the recess.

Your committee has given this bill very careful study and in order that there might be no mistakes, immediately after the hearings before the whole committee the matter was referred to a special subcommittee to draft and return to the whole committee a bill they thought would cover the subject and grant adequate compensation to these dependents.

The Senate passed a lower rate of schedules in S. 1279 than the schedule of rates provided by the House amendment to that bill. Since that time the Senate in the consideration of what was called the Bailey-Clark substitute for the Wheeler bill relating to the induction of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers into the Army of the United States attached to that measure a new schedule of rates to be allowed to the dependents of servicemen. That schedule is still considerably higher than the schedule of rates adopted in this House committee amendment. In this House amendment the increases in the amount of the allowances to servicemen's dependents are substantial ones.

It is an increase which I think meets the question of subsistence of these people based upon the latest estimates, the latest figures, and the latest cost of living. It is not of course as much as a good many of us would like to allow, but it is generous when you consider that under the law as it exists today the cost to the Government of the program covered by this legislation is more than a billion dollars a year, in fact around a billion two hundred million, this bill increases that cost, exclusive of what the servicemen provide out of their own pay to their dependents, by \$659,752,000. This is a rather substantial increase, and when you take into consideration the fact that they are going to induct fathers perhaps in the upper age bracket where the families are going to be larger than in the younger age brackets, the increase in the amount of the bill will perhaps exceed that by the time we induct them into the armed services.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the allotment made to the wife and the children of a soldier in service based on need? By this I mean such a case as the following: I hold in my hand a letter from the friend of the court in my county of Oakland complaining bitterly about \$50 a month being allotted to the wife of a soldier who is either a Government employee or who is working in a defense plant and earning \$50 a week or better in addition to that allotment. Is it based on need?

Mr. MAY. As to the class A dependents, which consists of a man's wife and children, it is mandatory, and it is fixed largely on the evidence in reference to not only the cost of living but the average of the conditions existing throughout the country in the various sections.

For instance, the cost of living in Detroit or Chicago or New York would probably be far in excess of what it might be in certain parts of the rural sections.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman has misunderstood my question. Is it based on the need of the individual? Suppose she is the wife of a man who has a million dollars in the bank, does the \$50 go to her just the same?

Mr. MAY. It certainly does, but I would call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this bill covers only enlisted men and we do not have very many millionaires in that group.

Mr. DONDERO. I have read this bill carefully. Does the bill recognize the decrees of the courts in regard to the welfare of the children of divorced wives of men in the service?

Mr. MAY. It certainly does, but it provides that the allowance shall not exceed the amount of the decree of the court.

Mr. DONDERO. I have a case where children have been allowed \$10 a week by the court. That has been found to be a reasonable sum. In this bill the children average about \$20 a week. Will the court's decrees supersede and take precedence over the provisions of this bill at the time it becomes law?

Mr. MAY. Not as to the children. The children will be allowed whatever this bill provides for them.

Mr. DONDERO. Regardless of the court order?

Mr. MAY. Yes; even though the court order is less than what the bill provides. As to the wife, she is bound by the court decree.

I might call attention to the fact there are 4,356,350 beneficiaries or dependents now receiving these allotments and allowances from the Treasury of the United States. That is as to both the Army and Navy, as I understand it, and when we increase the Army, as we are planning to do right along month after month, the number of these beneficiaries will increase in proportion to the number of men taken in, based, of course, on the size of their families. So that it may be estimated that by the first of next January there will be at least 5,000,000 people on the pay roll of the Government receiving these allowances. That is, men, women, and children.

In the first instance we allow a wife without a child \$50, \$22 of that to be paid by the soldier and \$28 by the Government. I would like to compare that figure with some of the other governments of the world and see how they match up.

In France a wife is paid \$9 a month. A relative, which includes members of the family, as I take it, and parents, \$9 per month, and a child \$4.05 per month in Paris and \$3.30 per month elsewhere. In this country we found that the cost of living was so variable and so different in the various sections of the country that there was nothing we could do except take evidence and determine what the average cost of living is, so far as we could, for the country as a whole.

We could not say with any degree of certainty or propriety that the people in South Carolina, for instance, where the climate is favorable and where the

cost of living is far below that of Michigan, should have one sum and those in Michigan should have another sum. So we struck a medium between the two conditions based upon the subsistence idea for the necessary support of these dependents and with that we have this vast increase of \$659,752,000 which, to my mind, means that when we come to the reading of this bill under the 5-minute rule and somebody offers an amendment to make the provisions of this bill, which is now \$20, \$30, we ought to think quite a bit before we vote to raise these rates. I know it is unpopular to argue against raises for these people, and none of us like to do that, but I think we ought to have an adequate and proper regard for the financial condition of the Government.

When these men return from the battle fronts and lay down their guns and when the diplomats and statesmen start to negotiate the terms of peace, unless we have a free country and a Government that is able to protect our citizens in their individual right to freedom, not merely the "four freedoms" but every freedom and any freedom that might be discovered, we will make a tragic mistake if we do not move with caution in these matters and save as far as we can any unnecessary expenditures.

I know that in some sections of my district there will be wives and children receiving money under this bill far in excess of anything that they have ever had before, but I do not think that ought to be a ground for complaint against the committee bill nor do I think that the committee bill ought to be raised \$1 in any instance; however, if you can convince me that the bill is wrong in any particular, of course, I will consent to changing it.

I would like to call attention to another country, Great Britain. We think she is a rich country. Perhaps she is rich. She is at least an English-speaking nation and ought to live on the same kind of a standard we live on. What does she pay to these people? To a wife Britain pays \$5.60 per month, to the first child \$6.80 per month, to the second child \$6.40 per month and to each additional child \$5.60 per month. That is far less than 50 percent of what we propose in the pending bill.

To my mind the bill ought to be adopted as it is written. It should not be amended except where amendments are necessary to make effective the legislative provisions of the bill. I am speaking only on the question of the amount to be allowed. When the time comes for a vote, I hope the Members will bear in mind that this is a very liberal Government and that these allowances will amount at the end of this year to four times what the Veterans' Administration, that has to do with all compensation, hospitalization, and pensions for the last war, is costing us annually, and that is a huge sum of money.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have two questions. Has the committee any

statistics that could be made available to us indicating how the committee arrived at this average?

Mr. MAY. The committee hearings are full of facts we gathered in the subcommittee, which included, I believe, the latest figures of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. What figures were used?

Mr. MAY. And all of the information we could get from the Manpower Commission and any other department of the Government that had statistics on that subject. The head of the Children's Bureau testified at length.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Did the committee give any consideration to the formula that was adopted at the time of W. P. A., not as to rates but as to the difference in the cost of living in various parts of the country?

Mr. MAY. I think we searched the situation as to what the cost of living was in the cities, in the urban communities, and in the rural communities very thoroughly. We had three different subjects of inquiry, the cost of living in the larger cities having certain populations, then cities of less population, then the urban communities, and then the rural communities.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish first to compliment the distinguished chairman for this word of caution which he has given us with reference to stepping up these pay rates materially. Second, may I say that I very much want to go along with him on a reasonable proposal such as here submitted, but it seems to me that in addition to what the chairman said about this increasing number that will go on the pay roll, we must bear in mind that perhaps in the near future a material acceleration will occur with reference to the dependents of fathers who will be inducted into the service a little faster than they have heretofore been inducted. On the basis of 5,000,000 payrollees, would it be unfair to assume an average of \$75 per enlistee? Is that a little high, would the gentleman say?

Mr. MAY. To include all the dependents, wives, children, parents, and all?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Certainly it would be too high. That would amount to \$4,500,000,000 annually.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the estimate? The gentleman may have mentioned it, but what is the estimated average as applied to the 5,000,000 figure the gentleman has used?

Mr. MAY. That is including all the dependents?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; everybody.

Mr. MAY. I do not have the average of that at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was just wondering if any average is available.

Mr. MAY. I doubt if it is available to anybody, because there are so many \$20 allowances, so many \$15 allowances, and so many \$50 allowances that we have no average of it in the testimony, I think.

I hope the bill as reported by your committee may be approved and passed.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, it is my firm conviction that our Nation cannot afford to adopt a pinch-penny policy when it comes to providing adequate allowance for the wives and children of men who are being inducted into the military service. At the present time the United States Government, through Selective Service, has enacted a policy which proposes to draft immediately thousands of heads of families. Many of these fathers have a number of dependent children. In view of the Government's determination to call these fathers into the armed service I insist that it is the duty of Congress to see that their dependents do not suffer hardships. It is time that we take immediate action to carry into effect what I believe to be the unanimous opinion of a majority of the Members of this House. The money we invest in the care of these children will pay large returns to our Nation in future years. It is a sound investment. These allowances should be generous enough to provide adequately for the wife and children of the men called into service. A father who must continually worry about the welfare of his family will not make a good soldier. Some will no doubt say that this is a very expensive program and cost a lot of money. That is true, but it must not be the determining factor. When we are giving away money all over the world and when we propose to feed the people of the various nations all over the world by setting up relief agencies for their benefit at a time when we propose the establishment of an international bank which will no doubt cost us billions of dollars, it seems to me we can afford to be more liberal with the wives and children of men who are called into military service.

Recently a mother of two children from my own congressional district wrote me in regard to this problem and enclosed a statement showing the actual cost of maintaining herself and two sons. Her husband expects to be called into the service immediately and she will be left with two boys, one 7 and the other 18 months. I want to call the attention of the House to this proposed budget submitted by this mother. You will find that every item mentioned is essential to the welfare of this family. There are no extravagant items in it and would only furnish the bare necessities of life.

Actual cost of maintaining mother and 2 sons (7 years and 1½ years of age)

	Per year
House (at \$25 per month rent)-----	\$300.00
Fuel (coal)-----	60.00
Utilities (gas, electricity, and water)-----	60.00
Insurance:	
Mother, \$1,000 policy costing (annually)-----	\$26.98
Son, \$500 policy costing (annually)-----	11.05
Son, \$500 policy costing (annually)-----	11.05
	49.08

Food:	Per year
Milk, 2½ quarts a day, at 12 cents (365 days)-----	\$109.50
Eggs, 2 dozen per week, at 40 cents-----	41.60
Butter, 1 pound per week, at 50 cents-----	26.00
Meat, \$1 worth per week-----	52.00
Potatoes, 30 cents worth per week-----	15.60
Vegetables, \$1.25 worth per week-----	65.00
Bread, 4 loaves per week, at 10 cents each-----	20.80
Oranges, 2 dozen per week, at 40 cents per dozen-----	41.60
Fruit (home canned, 1 quart per day, 365 quarts per year)-----	107.03
	\$479.13

(Below is listed fruit I canned this summer and actual cost.)

3 bushels pears (60 quarts), at \$4.90 per bushel, \$14.70, plus \$1.05 sugar-----	15.75
3 bushels peaches (60 quarts), at \$6.25 per bushel, \$18.75, plus \$1.05 sugar-----	19.80
2 bushels apricots (60 quarts), at \$8.50 per bushel, \$17, plus \$1.05 sugar-----	18.05
12 large pineapples (17 quarts), at \$5.50 per dozen, \$5.50, plus 30 cents sugar-----	5.80
60 pounds pitted cherries already sugared (25 quarts)-----	11.00
3 bushels plums (90 quarts), at \$7.20 per bushel, \$21.60, plus \$1.58 sugar-----	23.18
2½ bushels apples (53 quarts), at \$5 per bushel, \$12.50, plus 93 cents sugar-----	13.43
	107.03

School books and supplies for 7-year-old boy (estimated)-----	6.00
Cod-liver oil for both boys, per year-----	6.00
Dentist (twice a year) for all three of us (average)-----	20.00
Medical attention (low estimate)-----	10.00

Clothing:

Son, 7 years old:	
Shoes, 2 pairs, at \$3.50 per pair-----	\$7.00
2 half soles and heels for 2 pairs a year-----	3.00
Underwear, 6 pairs-----	6.00
Galoshes-----	2.25
Winter trousers, 4 pairs, at \$2.98 each-----	12.00
Summer trousers, 4 pairs, at \$1.98 each-----	8.00
Jacket, winter-----	7.00
Cap-----	1.00
Gloves-----	1.00
Shirts (4 summer and 4 winter)-----	8.00
Sweater-----	3.00
	58.25

Son, 1½ years old:	
Shoes, 2 pairs, at \$2.50 per pair-----	5.00
2 pairs half soles-----	2.00
Underwear, 6 pairs-----	4.00
Galoshes-----	1.50
Winter trousers, 4 pairs, at \$1.98 each-----	8.00
Sun suits, summer, 6, at \$1 each-----	6.00
Gloves-----	1.00
Snow suit-----	7.00

Clothing—Continued.	Per year
Son, 1½ years old—Continued.	
Shirts, winter, 4, at \$1 each-----	\$4.00
Sweater-----	3.00
	\$41.50
Mother-----	87.00
(The above estimate for my own clothes includes 2 pairs shoes, half soles, underwear, hose, house dresses, 2 good dresses per year, and a coat and hat.)	
Incidentals (including soap for bath and laundry, flour and other food-stuffs too numerous to mention)-----	25.00
Total cost of maintaining very moderately a mother and 2 small children for 1 year-----	1,201.96

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Military Affairs in its work today, like many of the other important committees of the House, is divided into subcommittees. This question, which on the face of it may not seem so involved, is underneath a very complicated one as to administration. I want to pay my compliments to the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs who have devoted themselves so closely to this subject, not only at the present time but during the past year in the development of the original bill, notably on our side the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDT], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON], and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE]; and on the Democratic side the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

I am going to suggest to the Members on this side, at least, that on detailed questions as to specifications you reserve your questions for the members of the subcommittee when they make their explanations to you today. They are better informed than are some of the rest of us, and I know they are in a much better position to give you the exact answers that some of you may require.

Generally speaking, I may say this:

Numerous House bills were considered and public hearings were held with the view to giving thorough consideration to all phases of the question of family allowances which has become of increased importance because of the drafting of fathers. Representatives of the War and Navy Departments and the Federal Security Agency were among those who testified.

Although formal reports on the bill have not been received from the service departments, and its relationship to the program of the President has not been ascertained, the committee understands that the provisions of the bill, except the matter of rates, are favored by the War and Navy Departments as being necessary and desirable on the basis of their year's experience in administering the Family Allowance Act. Such departments, other than confirming a need for

some overhaul and increases in the schedules of payments, do not make specific recommendations as to rates.

The principal changes which the bill, with the amendments recommended by the committee, will effectuate, are as follows:

(a) Increase greatly the family allowance for children.

(b) Increase family allowance for parents, brothers, and sisters who are dependent upon the enlisted man for chief support.

(c) Grant an initial family allowance for the month of entry into service in a pay status to wives, children, and parents, brothers and sisters, who are dependent upon the enlisted man for their chief support without any deduction from the pay of the enlisted man for such initial allowance.

(d) Include female enlisted personnel of all grades and aviation cadets within the provisions of the act.

(e) Make dependents of enlisted personnel of the upper three grades eligible for family allowances and suspend monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for dependents, as authorized by section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, for the period during which such family allowances are paid.

(f) Define the eligible dependents of female enlisted personnel.

(g) Remove limitations as to amounts payable to children where living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order, written agreement, or divorce decree.

(h) Provide for prompt and equitable payment by the Secretary of the department concerned of amounts due on death of a dependent.

(i) Clarify penal and administrative provisions.

AMENDMENTS OF S. 1279

A more extended study by the administering departments has brought to light some necessity for clarification of provisions of the bill as recommended by them to the Senate committee. These matters have been inquired into, and have resulted in several amendments of S. 1279 of a clarifying nature. Amendments of sections 6, 7, 7a, and 11 of S. 1279 as received by this committee are of this nature.

Aside from such clarifying amendments, S. 1279 is changed or modified in the following essential particulars:

(a) Rates in section 5 are increased.

(b) In section 6 the limitations upon allowances to children living separate and apart under court orders or written agreements are eliminated.

(c) In section 7 the reduction from pay of enlisted man having separate quarters is reduced and restricted to the upper pay grades.

(d) In section 7 a uniform rule is provided to govern termination of entitlement to family allowances, incident to any change in status of the enlisted man or dependent.

(e) Section 11 has been modified to insure inclusion of dependents of female enlisted persons and aviation cadets as eligible for family allowances.

(f) A new section is added defining the dependents of enlisted females and

fixing the allowances for their husbands and children.

(g) A new section has been added to provide an effective date for all provisions of the act with suitable protection to payees and to disbursing agents during the period of transition to new provisions of law.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to spend most of my time explaining some of the features of the bill. They are not particularly difficult to understand, if a Member will go over it and relate them to the provisions of the basic law. If each one will get his copy of the bill and go over it with me, I shall explain more in detail some of the provisions that we have changed, and try to tell you as best I can just what the changes are and how they will work out if this bill is enacted into law. Starting on page 11, the very first amendment makes the benefits payable to the dependents of all enlisted grades, whereas the present law restricts it to the four lowest grades. Only the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades are entitled to it at the present time. That is, the buck private, the first class private, the corporal, and the line sergeant. All grades above that under the law as it stands now are not entitled to dependent benefits, and the reason for that is that under the law those grades are entitled to commutation of quarters, if there are dependents, and, therefore, they were not included originally. That works a hardship in the case of a person who has as many dependents as a wife and one child, and certainly it becomes more difficult the greater number of children, because, under the law as it stands now, those persons in the first three grades get \$37.50 a month as rental allowance. If he were allowed to get the family allowance, he would contribute \$22, and the Government would contribute \$28 for the wife alone. For a wife and one child under the present law, the Government contributes \$12 additional for the child. That puts the Government's contribution up to \$40, which is in excess of the rental allowance. Of course, the greater number of children, the greater is that discrepancy, resulting in a manifest inequity. That will become more greatly accentuated, in the case of a man who has incurred heavy family responsibilities, and who may be eligible for the higher grades. This law would make it available to all. We propose to do away with rental allowances for those who take family allowances, but that comes in a later section, and I will explain it more in detail, when we get to it.

We next take section 3, where there is a material change. That divides the dependents into three rather than into two classes. At present we have class A and class B. Class A includes wife and children, and class B includes collateral dependents. The only thing necessary to show now in the case of collateral dependents is that he is dependent on the man for a substantial amount of support, and it has been held by the Office of the Comptroller General that as much as \$10 a month would be substantial support.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. What is the basis for the \$10?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was not set necessarily as a dividing line, but where a soldier had been contributing \$10 to his family, the Comptroller General said that that should be held to be substantial support. We did not set any dividing line or standard.

Mr. CELLER. Is a standard set up whereby a soldier would have to show dependence in any way?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Only to a substantial degree. We do this. We still keep that substantial feature. We call that class B, but we provide that no contribution can be made to a class B dependent in the event there are class B-1 dependents. The class B-1 dependents are those collateral dependents who are dependent on the serviceman for chief support. They must show that the man was their chief support. We have liberalized the amount payable under class B-1. We come to that in the next section. I call attention to the fact that under the operation of this particular amendment a good many of these collateral dependents will be dropped from the rolls because if there are class B-1 dependents, there cannot be a class B dependent, and, furthermore, a good many of those now carried as class B dependents will be relegated to this new class B dependent and if there are B-1 dependents, they will not be eligible to draw.

Mr. CELLER. So when it comes to class A dependents there need not be actual proof of dependency or chief support but there will have to be that proof in the case of class B?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There must be proof of substantial support when you come to class B-1. It must be chief support.

Mr. CELLER. Suppose a soldier has a wife?

Mr. SPARKMAN. And no dependents—no proof of dependence—just the record of marriage. I come to that later.

The next provision relates to the change of the rates. As I see it, this is the only controversial section in the whole bill. We have not increased the amount payable to the wife. Rather strange to say, no recommendation came to us except in one or two bills, proposing an increased amount to the wife. It is our theory that the wife need not depend entirely upon the allotment that is made to her, if there is no child. In fact, she should be encouraged in this time of manpower shortage to work and help support herself. So for her this becomes assistance rather than subsistence.

We have changed the amount payable to the wife and one child. Under the law as it stands now the amount payable is \$62. We propose under this bill to make it \$75. Under the law now there would be \$10 additional for each additional child. We provide there shall be \$20 for the second child and \$15 for each additional child thereafter.

We have increased the amount that is payable to a child living with a divorced wife.

By the way, the definition of "divorced wife," as given in the basic law is a wife who is separated from her husband, living under a divorce decree or order, which allows her alimony, and that she has not remarried. Therefore when we use the term "wife divorced" that is what is meant.

In no event, however, will a wife be allowed to draw more than the amount provided for in a court order or decree or written agreement between her and the serviceman.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I have had my attention called some time ago to a case where a divorce decree was granted and the child was awarded \$5 a month.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me come to that a little later. That comes in a later section, and if you will just withhold your question I will take it up then.

Well, I will answer the gentleman now. Regardless of whether the children are living under a court order or not, we propose to treat them all alike and to give the child the full amount to which the child is entitled under the bill, regardless of whether there is a divorce decree setting the amount at \$5, or being absolutely silent as to the payment. We propose to treat all children alike and to pay them the full amount regardless of court orders, court decrees, or written agreements. We do not do that with reference to the wife. We take care of the wife who is living under a divorce decree just as I have mentioned.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. DEWEY. Is there any over-all sum that will be allowed to a soldier, considering his collateral and direct dependents?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No aggregate. The law as it stands now does have an aggregate limit, but we took that out for the simple reason that under the proposed order we are going to take servicemen in without regard to the number of dependents. Therefore we felt that the limitation ought not to apply. Then in the next section are set out the rates for Class B, \$37, payable only in the event there are no B-1 dependents. The next section deals with Class B-1. There is a small change there and that is liberalizing the amount that may be due to the dependent parent of a serviceman. We have given to that dependent parent exactly the same amount we have given to the wife. Whereas under the law now that dependent parent should have gotten either \$37, or \$20 depending upon circumstances. If there are two parents we now propose to give them \$68. The payment that may be made to any Class B dependent must be paid all to one person.

The next section has to do with wives who are living under divorce decree. There is a limitation there which I explained a few minutes ago.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. We have a number of complaints where soldiers are a little disturbed that their wives did not receive their allotments until sometimes as much as 2 or 3 months after they enlisted, thereby creating trouble and difficulty. Does this bill remedy that situation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it does. That is in a later section that I will come to.

I have explained about a wife living separate and apart from her husband. The next provision is the very one that the gentleman just inquired about, the initial allowance. We provide under this bill that the Government shall pay the initial allowance. It is the intention for it to be paid from the induction center and to be paid probably within 2 or 3 days from the time the man goes into the service.

That goes directly to his dependents and is in the same amount as the schedule that was set out in section 5 that I just explained a few minutes ago. No part of the soldier's pay is taken for that initial payment. The Government assumes the responsibility of making the whole payment without charging anything to the soldier. We felt it was well for the Government to do it. According to Mr. Taft's testimony, it would relieve a great majority of the hardship cases that they are running into. Hereafter there ought not be any great delays.

General Gilbert testified before us when this bill was being considered, and he told us something about the enormous load that had been carried by the Office of Dependency Benefits, the new organization that has been set up within the last year; the new office space which had to be obtained at Newark, N. J., and the whole machinery started out new. There were considerable delays in the beginning, but they have been straightened out now except in a relatively small number of unusual cases where the proof has not been submitted or where some difficulty has come up in getting proper proof. So I think we can expect all of those claims to be handled expeditiously from now on.

Mr. CELLER. You might have a little difficulty later on. With reference to the soldiers who have been heretofore inducted, who did not get this additional allowance, would they have a right to make a claim against the Government because technically they would be discriminated against, would they not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, because the act takes effect, these new rates take effect subsequent to the enactment of this bill and, of course, there would be no backtracking. According to your argument men who were in the Army back in the days of the Spanish-American War would have a right to get the benefits of any increased rates subsequently provided, and it just would not work.

Mr. CELLER. I am glad to get the benefit of the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Next we get to the question of commutation for quarters; we give it to the three highest grades of enlisted men, and just here let me say that if they are already drawing commutation for quarters, they are given the right to choose whether or not they wish

to continue to draw rental allotment or whether they will take the family allowance. And to the explanation I made a few moments ago may I add that there will be an advantage to some of them to choose family allowance.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer an amendment when this bill is returned to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I propose to offer an amendment in connection with this particular feature which would require those men in the first three grades who elect to take rental allowance, rather than the family allowance, to show that they are actually paying under some kind of an allotment scheme an amount equal to the rental allowance to the dependents, the reason being that in the first place the rental allowance is paid on the basis of taking care of dependents, and this allotment bill is being proposed in order to take care of his dependents back home, and it is not right or fair for some man in the upper grades to be able to choose to take the rental allowance, which is being paid for the benefit of his dependents, and simply put that in his pocket.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I wish to compliment the gentleman for his proposal to add that amendment to the bill. I think that there is need for such an amendment in order to clarify and eliminate the danger of abuses through a soldier or sailor in the first three classes claiming the allowance, pocketing the money, and not using the funds for the support of his dependents.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the subcommittee would have agreed to adding that amendment had it had time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman kindly indicate the three grades he refers to?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are seven grades.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will take them in order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In any way the gentleman wishes to make the explanation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The seventh grade starts at the top and comes down; we start in the higher grades and come down to the lower. The buck private, so-called, is in the seventh grade. The first-class private would be the sixth grade; the corporal would be in the fifth grade; the sergeant, sometimes referred to as the buck sergeant, or the line sergeant, would be a fourth grade.

Then we come into the staff sergeant, which would be the third grade; the technical sergeant, I believe, would come next, in the second grade, and the master sergeant and the first sergeant would be in the first grade.

In the Navy we have a similar classification, which goes through the chief petty officers, and which includes all classes, as I understand it, with the exception of commissioned officers and warrant officers. I think I am correct in that statement.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I think the gentleman is incorrect with respect to the second grade; I think we included the technical sergeant in the second grade.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The staff sergeant would be in the third; the technical sergeant would be in the second, and the master sergeant and first sergeant would be listed in the first grade.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First sergeants were put in first grade about a year ago, and now they are in the first grade.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are two other provisions: First with reference to dependents of WAVES, WAC's, and other women who are in the service. The husband and the children of women in the service may be their dependents, but we do not pay it to them automatically; it is necessary to prove actual existence of dependency. It is realized that the wife may have children or a husband who are dependents, but payment cannot be made without proof of dependency of the husband or the child or children of the woman in the service, and they will have to prove actual dependency or chief support.

The only other provision relates to the effective date of the act. We make the act effective on the first day of the calendar month following its enactment. In other words, if it is enacted during the month of October, it will become effective November 1, and that is true, I think, in reference to payments and to the initial payment.

We do provide there shall be an adjustment period and we give to the departments concerned 4 months in which to make any adjustments; we also protect them against any overpayments that may have been made during that time because they just simply cannot adjust overnight.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I just want to ask the gentleman one question with reference to dependency of women in the service: Is it not true that as to all women in the service they are precluded from enlisting in the service if they have a child, dependent child, under 18 years of age?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe that is true; I think probably the age is 14 years, as to the WAC's; I am not sure what it is for the WAVES. But, the gentlemen can think of cases in which there might develop cases of dependency of a husband or a child after they went into the service.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I want to make sure that I heard the gentleman correctly with reference to the question of the cases arising out of divorce where there are children. I understood the gentleman to say that the compensation fixed by this act will be paid regardless of the amount allowed by the court, that under this law the Office of Dependency Allowance will pay the full amount allowable under this law and disregard any lesser amount which might be made by the court.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, even if the court decree is silent and does not give anything.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What do the hearings disclose as to the differences between the proposed allowances and the allowances that similarly obtained during the First World War?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry; I do not know that; someone else may have the information, but I have not.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And this second question if the gentleman will permit: What do the hearings disclose as to the differences in the cost of living now and the cost of living in the First World War?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We spent our time trying to study the levels of the cost of living at the present time rather than comparing it with World War No. 1. We did not try to arrive at the rates by comparing the present situation with that in World War No. 1; we tried rather to tie it to the present cost of living. I was going to come to that in a moment, how we arrived at our rates.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would assume that the committee did give consideration to the matter of the cost of living inasmuch as the committee proposes to increase the amount of the benefits.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We did that but we did not try to tie it to the First World War.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; unquestionably not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We already had the law; we were trying to meet conditions growing out of this war.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then how does it compare to the time we first fixed the benefits?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me state how we arrived at the figure that was finally agreed upon. The gentleman, of course, must know that in such legislation any particular figure arrived at is the result of conciliation and compromise. Some 15 or 20 different bills relating to this same subject have been introduced. They started out with a 10-percent flat increase. I do not remember just whose bill that was. I remember that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] was one of the early leaders, and if I recall correctly—I do not have his bill before me—but if I recall correctly, it provided for a 15-percent horizontal increase. Other bills then came along

with different figures. As it happened, we did not arrive at any quotient product on this but it happened that the average of all those bills would have been almost identical with what it provided in this bill. That, however, is just an accident, as I say; we did not arrive at it in that way.

Miss Faith Williams, the head of the Cost of Living Division of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, appeared before the subcommittee. You will find her testimony in the back part of the hearings. She testified that the average cost of living in 33 cities in the United States amounted to approximately for the wife about \$64 and for each child about nineteen dollars and some odd cents.

In addition to that she further testified that some items were included in those figures that probably would not have to be included in the Budget such as we were trying to set up here. For instance, she said, as I recall, that she allowed \$46 for life insurance. The Government takes care of life insurance under the Soldier's and Sailor's Civil Relief Act. Furthermore, the Government offers to the servicemen as much as \$10,000 life insurance, taking the premiums out of the soldier's pay if the soldier wants it. So about \$4 a month could come off of that figure.

Mr. MAY. Was that \$46 for insurance a monthly allowance or annual?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was on an annual basis; it was approximately \$4 a month.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield while he is on that subject?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. May I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that on page 60 of the hearings is a full tabulation of the cost of living in 33 of the large cities of the United States. I think the gentleman from Mississippi may be interested in these data.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. Miss Williams further on, however, made the flat statement as to cost of living. You will find it a little more specific in the testimony that she gave; so we tried to tie this increase just as nearly as we could to the cost-of-living figures. We realized that as practical matter that we could not possibly reach the highest level. We could not legislate, for instance, to meet the San Francisco level or the New York level. I think the table shows New York to be the highest, but recently it develops that San Francisco has the highest cost-of-living index. The amount we have allowed may be too much for some sections of the country but we arrived early in the consideration of this bill at the decision that we could not place this strictly on a need basis; in other words you could not have varying grants in varying parts of the country; we had to have a uniform level and after checking the various figures, I say very frankly some lower and some higher, we

arrived at the particular figures that are included in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to need, does the gentleman care to add anything to the statement that where there is no need at all for the wife and children, the committee gave consideration to that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the only remaining point I wanted to touch on. We discussed in the subcommittee and in the committee as a whole whether or not a need test should be applied as to the wife and children and we decided against that. There were two compelling reasons for that.

First, it would be practically impossible to administer with anything like expedition. If you went out to take proof of dependency of wives and children, it would take 3, 4, 5, or 6 months. As a matter of fact, I believe that the experience in World War No. 1 was a very unhappy one in connection with that. We had the spectacle of many dependents, such as would be classified as dependents under this law, not getting their dependency allowance until the war was over, even though the husband had been in the service many, many months before that time. Also, the law imposes upon the husband a legal obligation to support his wife and children regardless of their immediate need. I believe those were the principal reasons that caused us to say that we should not apply any dependency test to the wife. Of course, they must prove the status of marriage and of childbirth. When that is proven, then they automatically become entitled to the payments.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. In administering these class B and B-1 dependents, is there not a likelihood of a lot of confusion in the administration of the act between class B and B-1?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman, perhaps, has seen some of the Navy affidavits that have been sent out. The Army proposes to use a similar plan, and let the serviceman and also the supposed dependent both fill out a sworn statement showing the exact amount of income that those persons have had in the past and the part that the serviceman has contributed to it. Of course, there will be some irregularities—you cannot escape that—but there will be a check-up from time to time and the cases in which there has been fraud or in which there have been irregularities when called to the attention of the Office of Dependency Benefits or the department concerned will be rectified. If it is found that the dependents are not entitled to the allowance, they will be cut off and appropriate action will be taken.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. There is perfect understanding on the part of those who administer this law as to who shall be class B dependents and class B-1 dependents?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, in all probability upon final passage of this bill (S. 1279) to increase and liberalize family allowances of servicemen, there will be few, if any, votes against it, and under ordinary circumstances I would not take up the time of the House to discuss what is conceded to be a noncontroversial bill. My vote itself would be sufficient to indicate my interest and my approval of the measure. However, since I am a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which is scheduled to leave for the west coast next Monday to hold hearings on critical naval production problems in that area, and since I am advised that there is a probability that a vote may not be reached on this bill by Monday, I want to take this opportunity to advise you, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, that I am most thoroughly and heartily in favor of this bill, and that I hope it will pass without any opposition whatever.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, when this bill for allowances for dependents of servicemen is read for amendment, I intend to offer an amendment providing certain changes in the figures contained in the committee bill now before us. The amendment which I will offer will be to page 12, line 14, of the committee bill and will strike out the language in lines 14 to 19, including the word "child", in line 19, and inserting in place thereof the following language:

\$50; a wife and one child \$80, with an additional \$20 for each additional child. A child but no wife, \$42, with an additional \$20 for each additional child. A wife divorced but no child, \$42; a wife divorced and one child, \$72, with \$20 for each additional child.

The purpose of my amendment is to bring back the payments to be made to the wife and to the children of servicemen to the exact figures contained in the Senate bill which was passed on October 6, 1943, by a vote of 78 to 1 in the Senate. The House committee had the Senate bill before it at the time that it had under consideration the amounts which should be paid in the way of allowances and, so far as I can recall, there was no particular discussion which would indicate any reason whatsoever why there should be the particular difference between our bill as offered and the Senate bill. For instance, so far as the wife is concerned, the Senate bill and the committee bill are the same. So far as the wife and one child are concerned, the Senate bill provides for \$80, the committee bill \$75. There is no reason that I know of for that deduction of \$5. For the second child the Senate provides for \$20 and the committee bill provides for \$20. They are in exact agreement. When we come to the third and subsequent children, the Senate bill provides \$20 and the committee bill provides \$15.

In other words, the difference between the Senate bill, which has already been passed by the overwhelming vote of 78 to 1, and this committee bill which has been brought in here amounts to no difference in the wife's allowance, \$5 for the first child, no difference for the second child, and a difference of \$5 for the subsequent children. There is no economic reason whatsoever for that. In view of the fact that the Senate has adopted what I believe to be fair figures I believe that the House ought to accept them. Then there will be no question at issue in conference and we will know exactly what these dependents are to get.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I understand the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. If I were a member of that committee I would introduce a similar amendment to what the gentleman has suggested. I understand he will get recognition on the offering of the amendment because he is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. May I say it is a worthy amendment and I hope the House will support it.

Mr. CLASON. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I also was rather bewildered at the change of allotment for the first child as compared to the third child. We might be led to assume the third and fourth child would eat less than the first child. I do not agree with that assumption. They all eat pretty well.

Mr. CLASON. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. Miss Williams, to whom the gentleman from Alabama referred, testified before the committee, and it is presumed that she was the Government's own witness. She testified that because of the small amount of money the family is going to have, no matter how many children there are in the family, you cannot decrease the cost of living for each child after you have the first child. She stated that the amount each child must have is \$19.56. I see no reason why this House should try to make the child live on \$15, when as a matter of fact the child needs the \$19.56 to get just ordinary maintenance.

In offering this amendment I do so not only for myself but for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON], all members of the House Committee on Military Affairs, all of whom agree that the Senate figures ought to be retained in this bill when it is passed.

While I am satisfied that other cogent arguments can be offered in its support, I am ready to rest the adoption of this amendment upon the evidence received

at the hearings, particularly that of Miss Faith M. Williams, Chief of the Cost of Living Division of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. Her testimony appears at page 157 of the hearings. I heard her testify and am satisfied that her figures are more satisfactory than any other evidence I heard on the question of allowances. She testified that on figures compiled for 33 cities from all over our country—and they were not all the larger cities, some were smaller cities of less than 100,000 population—as of August 15, 1943, the actual expense of a wife without any children at a maintenance level was \$64.39. If the wife has one child to support the cost increases \$19.56. There is no change for each additional child.

It seems to me that wives who are without children may very well be given somewhat less than what the statistics show, because we know that a very large percentage of them, a vast majority of them, I may say, can and will go to work and will not depend upon this \$50 for their livelihood. On the other hand, if the wife has one or more children to take care of, in most cases she will not be able to work. So I believe that \$50 is fair for the wife alone and, if she has a child and her situation has completely changed, we should then add to the \$64.39, which Miss Williams testified is necessary for her support, the \$19.56 necessary for the first child. This is a total of \$83.95.

The Senate says that \$80 is fair. My amendment provides for the \$80. It cuts this woman \$3.95. I feel that she is entitled to the full amount of \$80, and this is supported by the statistics of our Government.

When we come to the additional children, we find, as I have said, that the wife cannot supply them with ordinary maintenance for less than the \$19.56. Therefore, I believe the Senate is well warranted and I believe the House will be well warranted in adopting that additional sum of \$20 for each additional child as provided in the Senate bill.

It is possible, of course, as we did in the present law, to provide \$10 for these additional children. The War Department in its bill suggested \$11. As I see it, the \$15 in the committee bill can be nothing more than a compromise between the existing law and the Senate bill for the third and additional children. In other words, they see fit to compromise on the child's means for actual subsistence. I do not want to compromise on any such issue, so I am willing to accept the Senate's figure, which is absolutely in line with competent testimony that was heard by the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I wonder if the gentleman would repeat those figures. You are going to leave the wife without any children at \$50?

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Then the wife with one child will receive \$80?

Mr. CLASON. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. How about the wife with two children?

Mr. CLASON. She would get \$20 more for each additional child.

Mr. STEFAN. That would be \$20 for each child uniformly all the way through?

Mr. CLASON. After the first child. The first child would get a \$30 allowance and each subsequent child \$20.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the gentleman say anything about Class B? Would his amendment have anything to do with the change in Class B?

Mr. CLASON. No, my amendment affects only Class A. It will be necessary to put in some clarifying amendments further in the bill to bring the other sentences in the bill into line with my amendment. I attempted to cover only the class A dependents. If my amendment is accepted by the House, it will result in the Senate and the House being in absolute accord.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has referred to the testimony as to the cost of living in 33 cities of the country. What testimony, if any, was there as to the relative cost of living in the country on the farms of the United States?

Mr. CLASON. I would say that the testimony was general and indicated that the cost of living in the smaller towns and smaller cities and in the rural sections, outside of certain northern places like Alaska, would be less than the amount indicated for these 33 cities. Nevertheless, we are in the position where, as to Detroit, for instance, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI], of that city, can make a splendid argument in favor of even higher figures, and he is doing so in connection with his own bill. However, I do not believe we want to leave the children generally on the lower level. Remember, there will be hundreds of thousands of them, probably millions of them, if there are 2,000,000 fathers in the service in the next year.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that one of the principal items in the cost of living is rental, and that rentals are very much lower on the farms than in the towns?

Mr. CLASON. There is no question about that. For instance, Miss Williams testified that the rental in the allowance is 20 percent of the total; that a wife with one child is going to be allowed \$16 per month in order to house her child, wherever she is. It is impossible for me to believe that any wife can get decent accommodations in the city of Washington or in New York, Detroit, or any important city smaller than those cities on \$16 a month for a wife and child. I do not think we want to go any lower, because while it is true that in the smaller cities and in the rural districts people are going to have a better standard of living than they have been accustomed to, or at least have the money for it, in some of the cities they are going to be worse off. Many families are going to

be far worse off. I think it will be a good thing for this country, in the few months more which we at most hope this war will last, to make this additional sacrifice of perhaps \$15,000,000 a month.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Did the gentleman's committee give attention to the thought that there might be a tendency for those in the country to go to the cities because of the increased amount provided for their living?

Mr. CLASON. There is no room for them in the cities, if the conditions in cities elsewhere are as they are in mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who served as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, which gave full and careful consideration to this bill, has covered the technical and administrative features of the measure so ably and fully that I do not propose to discuss them at this time. I do expect to make a few observations when the bill is read for amendment, but it seems to me that, at this stage of the bill, general debate seems to be lagging, and so my remarks will be brief. This is a highly important bill, and yet at the same time it is a complicated measure that carries with it a good many serious difficulties, about which there are many honest differences of opinion, but I want the RECORD to show at this point that I am heartily supporting this bill as reported by the committee, and I also indulge the hope that the House support the committee in the bill which it has reported, because I assert with confidence that it is a fair bill, and one that has been very carefully considered. No sum of money would adequately provide for some dependents of the men in our armed forces, but it seems to me that it should not be forgotten that in war, and especially in a war such as the terrible one in which we are now engaged, all of us, every man, regardless of his marital or family status, has certain obligations which he owes to his country, and that they necessarily carry with them a certain amount of sacrifice. And so it is just impossible to adequately pay enough in dollars to take care of his wife and children, but this committee was unanimous in wanting to make sure that it did adequately provide, at least reasonably so, for the wives and children of our gallant men in the service. We cannot support them in luxury but we must and will support them in decency. However, as I said, the matter presents very serious and complex difficulties. Many fathers have been drafted and more will be, so it is our duty to amend and make more liberal the existing law. Questions have been asked in the last few minutes about differences in the cost of living, which differences are apparent to all, because in the busy war-plant cities of the North and East, where the winters are very cold, like Buffalo, New York, Pitts-

burgh, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Detroit, the weather is much colder than it is in Florida, Mississippi, south Texas, or California, and where rents are incomparably higher, there is a differential there that is apparent upon its face. The same is true about living conditions in the cities as contrasted with living conditions in the country, especially in warm climates where they do not use so much fuel or clothing and many have vegetable gardens and a cow.

Then another question came before the committee, and that is, that there are many wives who have independent or comfortable fortunes or incomes while many thousands have good jobs. The women of the country have shown a marvelous spirit of patriotism and co-operation. Under Secretary of War Patterson testified before our committee a few days ago that forty-five percent of those now employed in the airplane industry are women. There are differences in pay and living conditions that we would like to compose, but it is impossible. I was one of the members of the committee who expressed regret that there was not some fair and just administrative method that could be worked out to see to it that those who are truly dependent be adequately provided for, but that those who do not need it should not receive so much. I know hardship cases that I would allot twice as much as provided by this bill, and I know some wives of independent means or with fat jobs I would not give a cent. In fact a suggestion has been made by those in social security, and I think encouraged by Mr. Charles Taft, who appeared before the committee and made a most favorable impression, that that would be the ideal way to work it out, on the same basis perhaps as you work out old-age assistance and other dependent claims under the Social Security Act; but the War Department seems to think that is impracticable and difficult of administration and that everybody must be put on the same basis. I am inclined to agree for fear it would create bad morale. So to that end the committee accepted the views of the War Department, and of this subcommittee, who gave it much study, and then the full committee went into the matter extensively, and I invite members to read the hearings on the bill, which are full, fair, and exhaustive. We have brought this bill back here with the almost unanimous vote of the committee, although the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] and others have indicated that they want to raise the figures up to the amount that is provided for in the Senate bill passed three or four days ago. I feel, however, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] does not make a very strong argument when he talks about what the Senate did, because if you will look at the bill we are considering you will find that on July 8th the Senate passed a bill on this very subject raising the allotment of the first child from \$10 to \$18, with \$11 to each additional child thereafter. They then thought a general sliding scale raise of 15 percent would be fair and just.

Yet while the House committee was giving careful and detailed consideration to this very bill, the body at the other end of the Capitol came along and amended the draft-the-fathers bill, giving the first child \$30 and every additional child thereafter \$20, when they had not held one minute's hearings on the bill and had no facts or record to support their views.

Somebody has got to pay for all this. We would all like to go much higher than this bill goes in truly dependent cases, but, after all, I have an idea that these boys of ours who are in the service, and their children, will have to pay for a large part of this sooner or later. This bill itself will cost in round figures nearly \$1,000,000,000. So while we want to be fair and just and as generous as we can be under the circumstances, yet I think we ought to be consistent and reasonable with some regard also for the taxpayers. We must, of course, first be sure that we do justice to these dependents of men who are in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. At the same time we ought not to be overly generous with wives and children who do not need it. We ought to bear in mind the differences in climate, rents, and the difference in the cost of living in various parts of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMASON. We are not generous enough with the hardship cases and we are too generous with many who are not dependent or deserving. We have done the best possible under the circumstances and I think it a fair bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I have in mind an enlisted man who left a wife and two children and entered the service. Since he has been in the Army he has married another woman.

Mr. THOMASON. Under this bill both wives are entitled to the allotment.

Mr. GROSS. They both will get it?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That case needs consideration. How would it be handled under this bill?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. The divorced wife is going to draw the allotment as well as the other one.

Mr. GROSS. But he was not divorced. He has got two wives and two children.

Mr. THOMASON. None but a legal or divorced wife could get an allotment. A woman who was never legally married would not draw anything. All children are entitled to an allotment.

Mr. GROSS. Each wife will get it, or will both get it and both children be cared for?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; any wife who was ever legally married, and regardless if divorced. All children by any wife are covered.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Soldiers pay taxes just as the rest of us—enormous taxes. They are not taxed on their salaries, but hundreds of thousands of those soldiers own property and they will have to pay heavy taxes, levied by the States and the counties as well as by the Federal Government upon their property. We seem to be inclined to think about all the soldiers as little boys who may be taxed through their children, but thousands of them are paying taxes now. Thousands of them are giving their lives to their country, and then the country through the estate-tax law will confiscate their estates after they lose their lives.

Mr. THOMASON. Well, what I have tried to say is that this bill has been given most careful consideration, and while there are some who think the figures are too high, I know others who think they are too low. Yet, when you investigate the record, and I refer you to some remarks which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] put in the RECORD a few days ago, you will find there is no country in the world paying anything like the amount to cover allotments and allowances to wives and children as is covered by this bill. That may not be anything like what is fair and just in some cases, but you must have an over-all picture. We must have regard for the taxpayers of the country, which include most of the men in the service. They and their children will have to help pay for this. So we must be fair and use our best judgment. We cannot let our feelings and our desires completely run away with us. There is not a member on this committee who did not give careful consideration and study to this bill. They wanted to be fair and just. That is the reason why I again express the hope that the House will support the committee in this bill that is now before us.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. How does the gentleman arrive at the figure of a billion dollars annually?

Mr. THOMASON. I believe the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has those figures. But for the Army alone under this bill the cost will be around \$600,000,000. Including the Navy and the Marine Corps it will run in round numbers close to \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. The figure which the gentleman gave is the cost for all services. It cannot be accurately estimated at this time, because there is no way of telling the number of fathers who will be drafted into the service. The best figure we are able to get is \$659,000,000 plus.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not have the figures before me, but I think they will run more than the figure the gentleman gave.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman was referring merely to the Army, in fact?

Mr. THOMASON. I believe my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] was reading from the record. He said that covered all those in the armed services.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course it is merely an authorization bill. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and I would like to get some information. This is an annual expense. I wonder what the administrative cost would be. Does the gentleman have any idea about that?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not have that and I do not believe the hearings disclose it, but the hearings do disclose the probable cost in the allotments proper.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there any estimate as to the number of individuals who are participating in this allotment?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; 2,800,000 now, and of course there will be a lot more.

Mr. STEFAN. That will increase, in view of the figures we received the other day regarding maternity care.

Mr. MAY. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman explain as to the original figure of \$50 per wife, without child, whether that would be the total amount this wife would receive or does she receive an additional sum in the way of an allotment from her soldier husband?

Mr. THOMASON. No; that is all the wife would receive. There is no change in the present law with respect to the wife, or in any bill that has been proposed. The wife continues to draw \$50.

Mr. STEFAN. I am referring to the present arrangement whereby the soldier receiving \$50 usually makes an allotment of around \$20 to his wife.

Mr. THOMASON. Under the present law he allots \$22 and this bill carries the same amount.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. In any event that goes to his wife, if he has a wife, and the Government puts up \$28.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that included in this \$50?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. So this will remain, under the present arrangement whereby the soldier puts up \$22 and the Government \$28?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes. Under this bill the wife will continue to draw \$50, of which the soldier pays \$22 and the Government \$28. And if this bill prevails and becomes law, the first child will draw \$25 and the second child will draw \$20, and any child after that would draw \$15.

Mr. STEFAN. How about those in class B where a mother has two sons in the service?

Mr. THOMASON. I am not sure about that.

Mr. STEFAN. Does she get \$15 from each son?

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Where a mother has two sons in the service, or more, in the class B category in this bill, does she draw \$50 from each son?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] to answer that.

Mr. KILDAY. Does the gentleman's question refer to the pending bill or existing law?

Mr. STEFAN. To this measure.

Mr. KILDAY. Under existing law substantial support entitles the parent to draw \$37.50 per month, but hereafter she could only draw chief support from one and draw substantial support from the other. In other words, she could not draw her chief support from her two sons; she would not be entitled to draw chief support from more than one son; she might be able to draw chief support and substantial support.

Mr. STEFAN. The present arrangement whereby she draws support from each son is eliminated by another amendment that is going to be put in this bill?

Mr. KILDAY. She would still draw from both, but in the same amount.

Mr. STEFAN. Which would amount to \$37?

Mr. KILDAY. The way the bill is drawn she would draw the same amount as a dependent wife.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. Where she is dependent; the amount of the allowance drawn by the mother would be the same as the wife, \$50.

Mr. STEFAN. That is the class B dependent?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; this bill provides for class B and class B-1 dependents.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Texas and to the gentleman from Nebraska that this point under discussion was debated and covered in the hearings on page 37, where I ask that question, the very question, of General Benedict. On page 37 of the hearings I ask this question:

So that if this mother had five sons in the service, each of them declaring her a class B dependent, she could then get \$37 from each of the five?

To which General Benedict said:

Yes, sir; if none of the five had any other dependents.

Mr. THOMASON. I am supporting this bill as it is reported to the House by the committee, and again I express the hope the House will not amend this bill, so that if there are any differences the bill can go to conference where we can work out something that is fair to the dependents of our fighting men and also fair to the taxpayers.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to compliment the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN],

for the very splendid hearings and very thorough study made by the subcommittee, and for the high caliber of the witnesses appearing before the committee. I got a great deal of valuable information from the testimony of the several witnesses, and if there is any document that each Member of the House should put away in his permanent files bearing upon the pay and allowance question for the Army and the Navy, I would suggest that he put the hearings and the committee reports on this bill in his permanent files, because there is some information here of far-reaching importance and value. I want, also, to state that the Army has been most fortunate, in my opinion, in having Brig. Gen. H. N. Gilbert as Director of the Office of Dependency Benefits. He has done things in the administration of this allowance program for the Army on a larger scale and a more efficient scale than any similar undertaking in our Nation. The administration of the program for the Navy and for the Marine Corps has also been very efficient, but the number of accounts and the size of the job, of course, has been much larger in the Army, and the job certainly has called for the utmost ingenuity, diligence, and care.

Mr. Chairman, the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, has been found to be inadequate in its provision for family allowances for other dependents. The bill (S. 1279) under consideration at this time has for its purpose increasing the allowances to a point that will provide the family and the dependents of the members of our armed forces with the necessities of life insofar as it is felt possible.

The hearings developed the fact that the provisions of our present law for class A dependents are fair enough as to a wife with no children, but that the allowance for children in the present law is very inadequate. The comparison of present rates and the rates proposed in the bill before us today is set out very clearly and briefly on pages 7 and 8 of the committee report—House Report No. 734.

The subcommittee made a very vigorous effort to determine the minimum maintenance costs for families and for other dependents and during the course of our hearings we secured some very valuable information for our guidance from the Cost of Living Division, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. The Chief of that Division, Miss Faith M. Williams, came before the committee and her testimony is of special interest in the matter of determining the allowances needed for the maintenance of families and dependents. Her testimony appears in the hearings starting at page 157 and continuing to page 166 followed by a number of tables which she brought before the committee and which are set out in the hearings, pages 166 to 179, inclusive. I know all of you are interested in the information and data on which the judgment of the committee was based in the establishment of the proposed allowances and I suggest that each of you make a special point to place in your permanent files a copy of the hearings on this bill

so that you will have available for your future reference and use the data and the information therein.

The census reports show that there are 197 cities in the United States having a population of 50,000 or more. The Department of Labor has kept statistics and data for 33 cities of more than 50,000 population and they have selected these cities from a list of 59 cities on which the best records were available from the Works Progress Administration study of living costs starting in 1935. Miss Williams used this list of 33 cities which appears on page 179 of the hearings for computing the estimated cost of maintenance, and in her testimony on page 159 of the hearings you will find that the average cost of living on August 15, 1943, for a wife in those cities is \$64.39, and for each child in those cities, \$19.56.

On page 164 of the hearings, in reply to my question, Miss Williams stated:

The budget includes food—a monotonous but nutritively adequate diet—clothing, housing, fuel, light, refrigeration, essential house furnishings, and such miscellaneous items as medical care, laundry, a newspaper, and a visit to an inexpensive movie once a week. It does not include an automobile, and it includes no savings except a small insurance policy.

It was then brought out that the allowance for insurance premiums per family was computed at \$46 a year, and the committee considered that this item could be struck from the estimates in view of the provisions made for insurance protection by our Government in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. In other words, the total for a wife and one child, which was given as \$83.95, could be reduced to \$80 a month and cover the average cost of maintenance for wife and one child for the 33 cities listed.

I mentioned earlier in my discussion that there are 197 cities of 50,000 or more population. The 33 cities in which the survey of the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been made, range in size from Portland, Maine, at 73,643 to New York City at 7,435,000. However, most of the very large cities have been included in their list. For example, 24 of the cities on their list have more than 300,000 population each, whereas there are only 30 cities in the United States above 300,000 according to the 1940 census. This situation leads me to conclude that the figures compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics more nearly represent the cost of maintenance in the larger metropolitan centers of our country. We have reason to believe that the cost of living is higher in these large metropolitan centers than it is in the smaller cities and the rural areas. However, we most certainly should not undertake to establish any variable allowance on the basis of variable living costs in the home communities of the families and other dependents of our service men and women. I believe we should give full consideration to the cost of living in these larger metropolitan centers, even though it results in a very liberal payment for fam-

ily maintenance costs elsewhere. We are reaching into those cities for large numbers of men and we are requiring them to leave whatever occupation they may have been following, to serve in the armed forces, whereas they must continue to support their families in the metropolitan centers in which they have been living. I firmly believe that is the obligation our Nation owes to the families and the dependents of the soldiers and sailors who are taken into the armed forces to fight for us in this war. For that reason, I not only voted for the increase in allowances provided in the bill as submitted to the House by the Committee on Military Affairs, but I also supported the motion in committee to set the allowance for the first child at \$30 per month.

I requested Selective Service to give me the total number of inductions and enlisted registrants from the 33 cities appearing in the Bureau of Labor Statistics list. I cannot release the numbers credited to each city but I am authorized to state that the total number of inducted and enlisted registrants from the 33 cities is 1,991,674 men. This figure does not include enlisted men who were serving in the armed forces at the time of the first registration for selective service. These men were not required to register for the draft. This number also does not include the women who are serving in the WAC's, WAVES, MARINES, and SPARS. This figure also does not include any inducted and enlisted registrants from the 157 cities between 50,000 and 300,000 population not included in the list and whose families likewise live in metropolitan areas. The figures do prove, however, that a very large number of our armed forces are looking to this bill and to this Congress for justice to the extent of providing a living for their families and their dependents at a maintenance level and I submit that it is our obligation to provide at least this maintenance level for the families and dependents of those who are serving actively in our armed forces.

The need for this increase in allowances is even more urgent and immediate as we face an increase in the drafting of fathers. The bill is of far-reaching importance and already strikes home to a very large number. Gen. H. N. Gilbert, Director of the Office of Dependency Benefits for the Army, testified that 3,900,000 applications for family and dependency allowances have already been made by men and women serving in the Army and that 2,800,000 accounts are being paid to approximately 8,000,000 dependents.

This bill is entitled to our vigorous support and I will also support an amendment that has for its purpose the increase of the allowance for a wife and one child to \$30 per month in keeping with the Department of Labor figures for modest maintenance of the families in those areas where they have made a careful study of living costs. I hope this bill will be speedily enacted into law as the need for it is most urgent.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. I think, Mr. Chairman, that every Member of Congress is agreed on the proposition that an increase in allowances to dependents should be granted. The only question before us is how much and to what extent these allowances should be increased. I think that we should all agree that the children of a serviceman should receive the same food, care, clothing, and attention as the children of a civilian receive. I am sure that this Congress does not intend to penalize the children of a father who is called into the armed service.

When the present act was passed by Congress there was no consideration given to the fact that we should be drafting fathers. In fact, a study of the testimony taken by the Military Affairs Committee at that time will show that the bill was designed primarily to assist the childless wife of a young I-A inductee. Now, we face the necessity of drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers as a military imperative. We already have more than 440,000 post-Pearl Harbor fathers in the service—and more than half a million men who have dependents other than wives and children. It is necessary to meet this changed condition by providing for a substantial increase in benefit payments to the dependents of these servicemen and the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers who will now be called into the service.

The present bill as reported by the House Military Affairs Committee will give \$25 to the first child, \$20 to the second child, and only \$15 to each additional child. I am wondering if we are, therefore, to assume that the third or fourth child must eat less than his brothers and sisters, or that he must be compelled to receive less clothing and other care. Frankly, I do not know how the committee arrived at this conclusion. Likewise, the committee bill provides for only \$11 for each additional brother or sister who is chiefly dependent upon the serviceman for his or her support.

On the basis of \$15 per month per child, we are telling the father who is being called into the service that we expect his wife to feed and clothe and house these children on the sum of 50 cents a day. Now, we can assume that one-half of this amount will go for food, and the other half for shoes, clothing, bus fare, school supplies, tooth paste, soap, medical and dental care, cod-liver pills, anticold tablets, a movie, comic magazines, or a little toy or trinket that every child hopes to get once in awhile. That means 25 cents a day for food, and 25 cents a day for clothing and care and these other incidentals.

To break it down further, it means that we expect the mother to bring this child up on 8-cent meals. Now, if any mother can feed a child on a basis of 8 cents a meal in any city, town, or village in the whole United States of America,

I would like to hear about it. For my part, I do not propose to experiment on the children of these servicemen. Now, when we take the \$11-per-month allowance that is being granted to chiefly dependent brothers and sisters under the provisions of the bill reported by the House committee, the situation becomes even more ridiculous. Allowing \$5.50 per month for food out of this \$11, it would mean that we propose that these brothers and sisters must live on 6-cent meals. Now, mind you, these are the provisions that are laid down for the B-1 dependents—the chief dependents.

I am not proposing any increases or changes for the class B dependents, or those dependent for substantial support. I am hoping that they can get by somehow under the provisions of the House bill. I do propose, however, a minimum allowance of 17 cents per meal per person for those dependents in class A and class B-1—that is, for the children of a serviceman, or for his brothers and sisters who are dependent upon him for support, and I certainly hope that no one in this House will accuse me of demagoguery in proposing an allowance of 17 cents for a meal.

To back up my position that 17 cents per meal, or 51 cents per day, food allowance is not exorbitant, I want to state that the Army discloses by its own figures that it costs the Government 57 cents a day to feed a soldier. This is done on a mass feeding basis, where food is bought in carload lots at wholesale or jobber's prices. It costs the Navy something like 62 cents a day. If this food were to be provided at retail prices, on an individual basis, you can be sure that the cost would be more than double the amount. And it is a known fact that a growing child will consume just as much food, and in many cases more food, than will an adult.

Canada has insisted on fair and decent allowances for the children of servicemen. Canada is not nearly the country that we are, and living costs are not nearly as high in Canada as they are in the United States. Yet Canada has seen fit to give \$99 to a wife and two children, and takes nothing from the soldier's pay to do so. Under the committee bill, the Government would pay only \$73 to a wife and two children, and \$22 would be contributed by the soldier, to make a total of \$95. In other words, \$73 from \$99 would mean that our Government would contribute \$26 less than the Canadian Government contributes. My amendment proposes a contribution of \$98 on the part of the Government, and \$22 from the serviceman, making a total of \$120 for a wife and two children.

I have read and studied various family budgets and charts and surveys prepared by various organizations, universities, and Government departments—yes, maintenance budgets, bare necessity budgets, emergency budgets, American standard of living budgets, health and decency budgets—yes, all sorts of budgets. Some make sense and some are silly and ridiculous. So I have prepared my own common-horse-sense budget—no frills—just enough to provide a very modest standard of living or just the minimum standards to keep a soldier's

family together in any part of the United States.

The schedule is as follows for a wife and two children:

	Cost per month
Rent.....	\$25.00
Food, 17 cents per meal, 3 persons.....	45.90
Clothing, dresses, shoes, stockings, underwear, etc., for wife and children all included.....	15.00
Gas, electricity, heat, etc., for operating the home.....	8.50
For kitchen utensils, furniture repair, laundry supplies, minor tools, linens and general house furnishings and needed things for the home.....	4.00
For medicine, cod-liver-oil pills, anti-cold tablets, doctors, dentist, hospital, general medical care for all three.....	10.00
Haircuts for children, tooth paste, tooth brushes, toilet soap and personal hygiene articles (and I am not including any beauty parlor waves, or beauty parlor manicures, perfumes or cosmetics which the husband would ordinarily furnish the wife).....	3.00
Movie once a month, daily newspaper, a magazine, a comic or children's book, a concert, school play, church social or bazaar, including all recreation for the three.....	3.00
Bus fare to school, church, or shopping, or to a picnic on holidays, including all transportation of any kind.....	4.00
Total.....	118.40

That makes a total of \$118.40, so in order to stay within my \$120 figure, we have left \$1.60 for all other miscellaneous articles and incidentals, such as an ice cream cone, stick of candy, birthday gift for the children, an Easter egg from the Easter bunny, a doll or a popgun from Santa Claus on Christmas, a meager contribution to the family church on Sunday, or perhaps a piano lesson for sister. Well, I do not know how you will do all of those things on \$1.60, but that is all that is left under my budget and the amendments that I shall make to increase allowances.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I notice the gentleman has charged \$10 a month for medical services. Does the gentleman assume that a wife and two children will all three be sick each month in the year?

Mr. SADOWSKI. No; that is on a \$120 a year basis. I am allowing \$10 as a monthly average for dental and medical expenses, hospitalization, everything that they may need. The kids need injections for diphtheria, antitoxins, and various things. One hundred and twenty dollars a year for medical and dental services is very little.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will not the gentleman from Illinois on the minority side yield me a few minutes?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, the House committee bill proposes to do all of these

things on \$25 less per month. Do you think it can be done?

Am I high on any of the allotments that I have submitted in this breakdown?

I should now like to read a letter from Mrs. James Roach, of Columbus, Ohio:

I am a woman, left with two children to raise, on a Government allotment. My husband was drafted into the army last March and since then it has been a struggle for me to keep my children in shoes and the necessities of life.

I am allowed \$72 a month to feed, clothe, and house two children. And it certainly can't be done. Different agencies have suggested that I go to work and help myself. Not only am I unable to work, but it's hard to find suitable places in which to put your children.

I don't think it fair to the children to deprive them of their mother and father both. It's hard enough on them to do without a father. And I couldn't take interest in them and work at the same time.

There are hundreds of mothers just like me, without a home and hardly enough to live on.

I have been to housing projects, which were supposed to be for people with limited incomes, asking about an apartment. At each one I received the same answer, "We're terribly sorry, but we can't rent to a person depending on such a small amount of money. And besides these apartments are for defense workers only."

If my husband isn't doing defense work, then no one else is. And he's getting the least pay, too. The ones who are in defense jobs are making better money than they ever did in their lives.

Because they buy bonds and are helping in the war effort, they get the privilege of renting homes where I can't. And I am sacrificing a whole lot more and getting so little. No one realizes what we sacrifice. I have given up my husband, broken up my home, and the essentials of life which I did have are gone. I haven't clothes fit to be seen on the street.

What are we women supposed to do? Do others have these same difficulties finding housing?

Can a person pay rent, gas, electric, doctor, medicine, clothes, and insurance on \$72 a month? If it can be done, then how?

And this letter from Corp. R. J. Payne, Seymour Jackson Field, N. C.:

Amen, for your efforts to obtain a reasonable hike in our family allotments. Have wife and two children, and they have been having tough sailing trying to get by on present allotment. My greatest worry is the welfare of my family, as I prepare to go overseas from this replacement center. Again, thanks.

And also one from a grandmother, Mrs. Carey, of Detroit, Mich.:

I read with much interest your article about an increase in allowances for soldiers' dependents, and I want you to know I and hundred: of others appreciate your efforts. I am an old grandmother and the allowances don't affect me, but I feel so sorry for young mothers struggling along and trying to make ends meet on the meager allotments. Twelve dollars a month doesn't even pay the doctor's bills for the shots children must have for whooping cough and diphtheria. They are doing without baby beds, carriages, bassinets, and strollers. They can't buy all the clothes a baby really needs if they get the proper formulas and baby powder, soap, and oils they need. The only way they have of getting all the necessities is having friends give showers.

Please do your best to give them a larger allowance. It's hard enough for them having their husbands away fighting for us.

Now, I wish to submit to the Membership of the House that I am not asking for substantial increases in allowances. My amendments take into consideration only the actual costs of bare living necessities; and I want to assure the Members of this House that I would not offer these amendments if I felt that the committee bill would only meet the primary needs of the servicemen's dependents. My colleagues who meet household expenses will agree, I am sure, how totally inadequate are these provisions in the committee bill. Why a man is allowed \$350 per year income tax exemption for each child or dependent even under the new tax bill. This is \$30 per month. And who is it who will arise and say that this exemption is too much, that he can take care of his dependents for less? Yes, and for the wife and home maintenance we have allowed a great deal more, and I have heard no one say that the exemption for the wife and maintenance of the home was too great an allowance. Then why shall we look for new budgets—new allowances to bring down the allotments for these fathers, these soldiers who are going into the service for their country? Are their children going to eat less or wear less clothes, when the father goes into the Army? The members of the Ways and Means Committee who have made these income-tax exemptions for dependents after many years of study know full well that the exemptions that they have submitted for dependents are awfully skinny and cut to the bone. Why should we come here now and tell the father who is in the service or going into the service, that we will take care of his children on half of this amount? It just does not make sense, and it will not make good soldiers.

Of vital importance to the winning of the war, which has only entered its bloodiest phase, and to the future of the country after we have won the war, is morale. Not only here at home, but morale on the battle fronts—in the Pacific, in Italy, and on all our far-flung battlefronts. Adequate allowances to the wife and children will strengthen the home front, which, as President Roosevelt has so rightly said, "cannot be considered apart from the fighting front." A man's family is the closest thing to his heart. We cannot allow our servicemen's families to suffer want. We owe our fighting men, "who give their lives, while we give our dollars," the satisfaction and comfort of knowing that their loved ones are not being deprived of the necessities of life, while they offer their lives to preserve our democracy. It would be denying their families the very thing these men are fighting for.

Oh, I know that certain Members have said, and will say, "Yes, but look at the tremendous increase in cost that these allowances will bring." This, to me, is the weakest argument of all. I admit that it will cost more money. Yes, and perhaps a lot of money, depending on the number of fathers with dependents that we take away from the family and home, but in answer, I submit that this is a big war—a total war. It is a war to save all that we have built over more

than three centuries. In answer, I say that America's children are her future, and this future must not be denied by any Member of Congress to the children of a soldier. What is money when weighed against stunted, sickly bodies and sickly minds, which, to my mind, would be the inevitable result of our failure to increase dependency benefits to the actual amount required for the bare necessities of life. Oh, yes; we have money to take care of children all over the world under lend-lease. I definitely am not criticizing our action in this respect, because I think that it is the proper thing for us to do. But I cannot, and never will be able to, agree with anyone who brings up the question of costs and expenses when it comes to taking care of our own children, and especially those children who are left behind by the fathers who have taken arms to fight for our country. Certainly our first obligation is to the children of our own fighting men.

In conclusion I wish to submit a schedule showing the exact changes in allotment increases that my amendments will make to the House committee bill:

Sadowski amendments compared with House committee allowances

Dependents	Committee bill	Sadowski amendments
Wife.....	\$50	\$55
Wife and 1 child.....	75	90
Wife and 2 children.....	95	120
Additional children (each).....	15	30
A child but no wife.....	42	42
Each additional child.....	15	30
A wife divorced but no child.....	42	42
A wife divorced and 1 child.....	67	77
Each additional child.....	15	30
Class B dependent or dependents (payable only while there is no allowance payable to any class B-1 dependent).....	37	37
Class B-1 dependent or dependents:		
1 parent but no brother or sister.....	50	55
2 parents but no brother or sister.....	68	90
1 parent and 1 brother or sister.....	68	90
Each additional brother or sister.....	11	30
2 parents and 1 brother or sister.....	79	120
Each additional brother or sister.....	11	30
Brother or sister but no parent.....	42	42
Each additional brother or sister.....	11	30

I also wish to submit an article from the Washington Times-Herald and a letter which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of October 13, 1943, from a father soon to be drafted:

[From the Washington Evening Star of October 13, 1943]

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The drafting of fathers has been making a lot of headlines lately—to the detriment, I am afraid, of the patriotism of the vast majority of the men in this category. It seems that almost everybody has been heard on this subject excepting those most vitally interested in it, namely, the fathers themselves. As one of them, I am becoming pretty well fed up with all of this controversy, which, in my opinion, is being carried along the wrong lines of reasoning.

I am a Government employee, having given up in 1941 a small business in the Middle West to accept a moderate-salaried position in a permanent agency here in Washington. There are 2 small children in my family, aged 18 months and 42 months. I am nearly 37

years old, and my local board in my former home town recently has reclassified me into 1-A. I have no objection to the board's action, because it had no other choice. My home community is principally agricultural, to which several new munitions and ordnance plants have been added in the last 2 years. The blanket deferment of farmers and the occupational deferment of the workers in these plants have exhausted my local board's supply of single and childless married men. And, in accordance with regulations, any ideas to the contrary notwithstanding, draft quotas are levied without regard to the number of available single men in any given board area.

Inasmuch as I have a very low order number, I am expecting to be called for induction this month. My family can expect no help, financial or otherwise, from either my wife's or my family. My wife could work outside of the home if the children could be well cared for at a reasonable cost. But it seems to be impossible to secure the services of a trustworthy maid at a figure which would allow my wife a net increase in income after assuming the additional expenses of clothing, transportation, and other incidentals so necessary when a mother returns to a business or professional field. Therefore, if I pass the physical examination at the induction station, my family is doomed to what is actually a starvation income.

POP.

[From Washington Times-Herald of October 7, 1943]

DOCTORS REFUSE BABY CASES AT ARMY PAY, WIVES CHARGE

(By Howard Whitman)

Pregnant wives of enlisted men are having troubles—plenty of troubles—trying to take advantage of the Government's plan for free prenatal and obstetrical care. A survey of eastern cities has revealed that these stumbling blocks are impeding the smooth functioning of the plan:

1. Doctors in many cases, according to complaints registered by enlisted men's wives, have refused to work for \$50 maternity fee which the plan provides in most States. The doctor is forbidden to receive any additional payment from the patient.

2. The extreme shortage of hospital facilities makes it difficult for Army wives to get accommodations at the figure which the Government allows—approximately \$60 for 10 days in a maternity ward.

Last March 18 the emergency maternity and infant care plan was passed by Congress and approved by the President with an initial appropriation of \$1,200,000.

An additional appropriation of \$4,800,000 was made in July and last week \$18,620,000 was added. The money is used for Federal grants-in-aid to any States which join in the plan. So far more than 40 States have joined.

A pregnant woman is entitled to free care if she is the wife of an enlisted man in the lower four grades. If her husband is in the upper three grades she also may have the benefits by supplying a certificate of financial need.

Now if—and this is a big if—the pregnant wife finds a doctor who will take the case for \$50 and a hospital which will make room for her, she gets the application signed up and returns it. It then is sent to the State department of health, which makes the payment.

Newspapers have received numerous complaints that the future mamas were stymied when it came to getting a doctor. "When they find out it's a serviceman's wife they refuse the case," was one typical remark. "They don't want to deliver our babies for \$50 when they can get \$150 from somebody else," was another.

A spokesman for Army Emergency declared that his organization and the Red Cross had received numerous complaints of a similar stamp.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently taken the position that only as a last resort should men with dependent children be inducted into the armed services. That the American home is the foundation of our social system would scarcely be denied by anyone. That it would be threatened by ignoring dependency in the induction of men with children into the military service is equally obvious. It follows as a matter of course that if the allowance we provide for in this bill is inadequate a decent standard of living cannot be maintained for the dependents of a soldier. Should a wife be compelled to accept employment in order that such standards be maintained, a juvenile delinquency problem is presented.

In the very near future it is estimated that 446,000 fathers will be called into military service. During the year 1944 this number may be considerably increased. The question of whether pre-Pearl Harbor fathers should be inducted is no longer a debatable issue, for already such inductions are under way, and a measure in the other body to prevent or to delay their induction has been overwhelmingly rejected—rejected no doubt because of the opinion of the Army and Navy high command that the armed services must reach a certain size if victory is to be assured.

Congress wisely will not set up its judgment against that of General Marshall and Admiral King as to the needs of the Army and Navy. At the same time Congress and the country will hold to strict accountability those who have brought the manpower situation to its present sorry state. This much is certain, Congress is not to blame. When Congress was asked to provide the machinery for the selection of men for military service it acted with dispatch. Obviously, Congress could not undertake the administration of the law. This power was properly delegated to the President, who was given full authority under the Selective Service Act to make necessary rules and regulations to carry the provisions of the law into effect. These delegated powers, however, were not without reservations, and one of those reservations was that dependency should be a ground for deferment.

For a time dependency was recognized by Selective Service as a ground for deferment, and the declared intentions of Congress were respected. With the transfer of Selective Service to the War Manpower Commission, however, the picture quickly changed. With characteristic bureaucratic arrogance the War Manpower Commission has completely ignored the will of Congress. The plain provisions of the Selective Service Act have been violated by this agency. Although Congress specifically provided that dependency shall be recognized as a ground for deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, Mr.

Paul V. McNutt, in his so-called work-or-fight order, declared that dependency should no longer be recognized. The ordering of men from one industry or occupation to another under penalty of being inducted into the armed service, regardless of dependency, is perhaps as glaring an example of bureaucratic usurpation of power as we shall ever witness.

The Selective Service Act was passed solely for the purpose of raising an Army and Navy. Not a syllable of its terms even remotely authorizes the conscription of men for industry. Yet it has been and is being used for that purpose. It has been many months since men with children have known what their status is under the selective-service law. Perhaps no group has been more confused than the fathers of this Nation by the never-ending series of conflicting orders and news releases which have emanated from the War Manpower Commission. I think we can say without fear of serious contradiction that the bungling of the manpower situation by this agency has largely been responsible for the drafting of fathers. The War Manpower Commission permitted Government departments to be loaded with men of draft age. Thousands of them would still be there had it not been for the protests of Members of Congress, particularly the Draft Deferment Subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of this House. Industry has likewise been permitted to hoard labor, with no sound over-all program designed to provide replacements for those eligible for military service. Where replacement programs have been adopted it was because industry itself acted and not because of any sensible action on the part of the War Manpower Commission.

Neither General Marshall nor Admiral King are asking for fathers. Undoubtedly they would prefer men with lighter obligations. They are asking only for men. The responsibility for supplying them rests solely with the War Manpower Commission, and the inability of this Commission to supply needed military personnel from single men and married men without children is largely responsible for the legislation before us today.

Some persons will argue that the passage of this bill will greatly add to our already-heavy financial burden. This, of course, is true. But I for one do not feel that the wife of any serviceman should be compelled to seek charity if perchance it is necessary for her to remain at home in order to care for her children. This Nation has not been niggardly with the millions now employed in war plants. We have appropriated hundreds of billions of dollars for the conduct of the war. Our appropriations for lend-lease exceed \$60,000,000,000. Notwithstanding a price-control act, prices of some commodities have doubled and trebled in the last year or two.

No one is more for economy in government than I. No one will vote more readily to abolish every useless governmental bureau, activity, and employee than I. This must be our policy if we are to escape national bankruptcy or avoid taxation beyond the ability of the American people to pay. But I am not

willing, under the pretense of economy, to deny to the dependent wives and children of those who must do the fighting and the dying that which is necessary for them to live in health and decency. I am, therefore, in accord with the provisions of this bill. In the subcommittee which drafted this measure and before the full committee I proposed an amendment to pay to wives with one or more children, amounts slightly in excess of that provided for in this bill, beginning with \$80 for a wife and one child. The amounts finally agreed upon represent the combined views of the members of the committee and I believe are the least we should approve.

In this connection I would call your attention to the very complete testimony furnished the committee by the Chief of the Cost of Living Division of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. The record furnished by this Division discloses that on a Nation-wide average \$83.95 is required for a wife and one child to live in a fair state of health and decency. As a small part of this amount represents insurance, premiums on which are guaranteed under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, this amount can be slightly reduced, but certainly not very far if proper standards of living are to be maintained.

Except for very slight differences of opinion as to the allowances which should be paid to wives with one or more children I believe I am correct in saying the Military Affairs Committee was in complete agreement upon this bill. It was approved after extensive hearings with a view to doing justice to those who might be beneficiaries under the act, as well as those who must pay the bill. In a number of respects we have exceeded the recommendations made by representatives of the War and Navy Departments. Moreover, our figures are below those recommended by some of the witnesses who testified before us.

Obviously the allowances provided for under this bill, together with the pay of servicemen, will be insufficient in many cases to meet the financial obligations of affected families. In this connection, however, it should be borne in mind that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act would apply so as to prevent mortgage foreclosures and the like, and will protect private insurance up to \$10,000.

It necessarily follows that many inequities will result from the passage of this legislation. As it is not essential that wives and children be actually dependent, some allowances are bound to be out of proportion to actual need, but this cannot be helped. Under the existing act it is mandatory that an allotment be made to a wife regardless of her financial status. She may be employed at a salary many times the pay of an enlisted man and in equity and good conscience not be entitled to anything. There is only one way these inequities can be avoided and that would be to require dependency in fact to be established in all cases. This, of course, would be a tremendous job. To accomplish it a gigantic administrative agency would have to be set up. This would not only be costly, but would result in a further drain

upon manpower. In the end, the cost in dollars and cents would probably exceed the amount of the inequities, to say nothing of the delay that would be encountered in paying allowances if every case had to be investigated. I am sure this House neither wants to set up another bureau nor delay the payment of allowances to dependents of enlisted men and women.

Among other things, this bill for the first time makes it possible that allowances be paid to the dependents of women in the armed services. So far as they are concerned, however, dependency must be established. As to a husband or children of enlisted women, dependency in chief must be proven. This, for example, would make it impossible for a WAC or WAVE to make an allotment to a husband serving in the Army or the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we all realize the urgency of this legislation, particularly now that fathers are being inducted and women are now a part of our armed forces. The increased allowances provided for in this measure are supported by evidence before our committee, and are necessary if this Government wants the children of its soldiers and sailors to live in a state of health and decency while their fathers are offering their lives in order that the Republic might be preserved and all of us be permitted to live as free men and women.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, from the very beginning of the expansion of our armed forces Congress has realized the necessity for providing for the financial and moral obligations of those who were to be taken into the service. At about the same time the Military Affairs Committee reported the Selective Service and Training Act it also reported the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

I am afraid that in the debate here this afternoon we have lost sight of the fact that under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act many benefits accrue to those in the armed forces. Under it, for instance, the payments on a soldier's home during the time he is in the Army are frozen. Payments under any chattel mortgages he may have, whether they be on a washing machine, automobile, furniture, or what not, are frozen. Premiums on private insurance are guaranteed up to an amount sufficient to carry \$10,000. This is in addition to the national service life insurance issued by the Veterans' Administration. The private insurance premiums are guaranteed by the Federal Government during the time he is gone. When that act went into effect during a time of peace its provisions were regarded as sufficient to provide for the type of man then subject to military service. Very shortly after war was declared we realized that millions of men must enter the service. The allotment and allowance bill was reported out of the Military Affairs Committee and passed by the House. The payments provided then were regarded as sufficient, considering the family status of the

men to be taken into the service. In my opinion, however, in violation of the plain letter of the law the Selective Service System has seen fit to provide that dependency shall be no longer regarded as ground for deferment. As I say, I regard that as being in total derogation of the plain letter of the statute. This House has stated that it regards it as being such and passed a bill to prevent the disregard of the dependency status. Notwithstanding our objection, practically unanimously expressed by this House, the other body did not see fit to proceed with that legislation. We are now therefore faced, even though it be in apparent violation of the law, with an undetermined number of fathers entering the service. When that situation arose we all agreed that there was a real necessity to revise the allowance and allotment law now in effect. As soon as we reconvened after the recent recess the Committee on Military Affairs went into session on this very question. There has never been any disposition on the part of the committee or any of its members to be niggardly about the proposition. There has been a sincere effort to provide as nearly as possible for the situation in which we find ourselves.

It is true that those who appeared before the committee, including social workers, those from the security agencies of the Federal Government, and the representatives of organized labor agreed that there is a wide variance in the cost of living in various parts of the country. There can be no doubt but that the cost of living in those parts of the country in which we have a more equable climate is far less than in the parts of the country where there is a rigorous winter. It is also true that there is a wide variance between the urban centers, particularly those where the pay rolls have been so enormously increased by war production, and the rural areas. I see our friend the Delegate from Alaska here, who has told us of the urgent problem in Alaska, in which the cost of living is even in excess of the highest places in the United States. Then we have the situation in Puerto Rico in which the cost of living is far below the lowest places in the United States. So we have here a problem which has challenged the sincerest attention and the very best efforts of the Committee on Military Affairs. We do not want to be niggardly, as I said before, and at the same time we want to keep it as nearly within bounds as possible.

What is the alternative? Should we fix a reasonable amount which would be static throughout the United States, or should we grant to some administrative agency the right to say that an additional amount shall be allowed in hardship cases or an additional amount be allowed in those areas in which the cost of living exceeds the normal or average cost of living? After a very careful consideration, and some of those considerations I expect to detail to you, the committee came to the conclusion, and I believe I am correct in saying it came to the unanimous conclusion, that it is better to make it a fixed amount to apply uniformly throughout the Nation.

Some of those considerations were these: If you delegated it to an administrative agency you would have a situation in which that administrative agency would have the power to determine what families of what service men shall receive what additional amount of money and the length of time that they shall receive it. I think on its face this House would not agree to a proposition of that kind. It contains far too many dangers to commit to any bureau or to any agency that might be headed by a politically ambitious individual. That is only one of the considerations.

There is another consideration. All of the members of the armed forces who appeared before us agreed that it would be destructive of the morale of the service if one man in the service with a given family status should be receiving more than another man in the service with the same family status. It would be destructive of morale. I can see that if a sergeant on duty in the headquarters of the service command should be drawing more for himself and his family than the tail gunner on a Flying Fortress we would be in a situation quite difficult to explain to the soldier, and to his family as well. So we were driven to the necessity of bringing in the type of bill that we have brought in here, believing that it is not possible for us to go to any other system which would be workable.

What should the amount be? It should be adequate, or as nearly so as possible, for the situation in which we find ourselves. Figures appear in the hearings. I call your attention to the fact that they show the cost of living in 33 cities in the United States, and I wish all of you would look at that list of cities very carefully, because I think you will agree that it contains practically every city you have ever heard of in which there are now tremendous war activities. It is a fact that the cities in which the average per capita income in the United States is the highest, also have the highest cost of living. We have the following cities shown: Atlanta, Baltimore, Birmingham, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Houston, Indianapolis, Jacksonville, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Manchester, Memphis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Mobile, New Orleans, New York, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Portland, Maine, Portland, Oreg., Richmond, St. Louis, San Francisco, Scranton, Seattle, and Washington, D. C.

I grant you that they vary in size, but there is not a congested war area not included in those 33 cities. The allowance is based upon those figures. I do not know of any other place that you could go if you wanted to be sincere to provide a family maintenance level if you did not go to that agency which the Government maintains to provide the index on the cost of living. That we have done.

The figures appearing in the schedule of payments in this bill are not in all instances as large as those appearing upon the cost-of-living index. But the family maintenance level shown on the index is based upon many northern cities and cities in which there has been a

tremendous expansion in pay rolls. The index figures will show that the average in those 33 cities for a wife alone is \$62.94 and each child \$19, so that under that, figuring a family of four, the cost would have been \$120. Under this bill the allowance totals \$110. I say that is a pretty fair average when you take into consideration the cities upon which the figures and the cost of living index are based in the Nation as a whole.

Something has been said here about the Canadian figures. I am not in a position to state exactly what was said, but my recollection is it was a little higher than is in fact the case. I have the Canadian figures. It is not possible to state the exact total contribution for families under the Canadian system. They have a very cumbersome system which they themselves have found to be unworkable and they have recently been working with our Office of Dependency Benefits in Washington and in Newark in an attempt to revise their plan and to install our system. Under that system the soldier contributes what amounts to one-half of his pay. He contributes 15 days of his pay, never less than \$20 a month nor more than \$33 a month, no matter what his rank may be. The only instance in which Canada pays a family allowance more than ours is to the wife alone. I am talking now of the Government contribution because it is not possible to have a comparison of the family payments due to this sliding scale under the various grades of the Army in Canada. The Canadian Government contributes for a wife alone \$35 a month, whereas under the proposed bill we contribute only \$28, the soldier contributing \$22 for the total payment of \$50. For a wife and one child, Canada contributes but \$47 per month. We contribute \$53 per month under the proposal contained in this bill. In Canada for a wife and two children, \$59 per month, whereas under this bill the Government contributes \$73 per month. Then for six children, which is the maximum in Canada, the total of the Government contribution would be \$93 per month, whereas under the proposal now before us the Government's contribution in the United States for a wife and six children would be \$133 per month, and there is no limit upon the number of children under this proposal. To each of the above Government contributions under this bill must be added the \$22 paid to dependents but deducted from the soldier's pay. So that we are in excess of the contribution made by any other nation in the world.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, that we should do all possible. As I said when the pay bill was before us here, there is no compensation adequate for those who are engaged in active combat. Those tens of thousands of my fellow Texans who are in the Army and Navy and Marine Corps and rendering such an excellent account of themselves are not hired at \$50 a month, nor could they be hired at \$5,000 a month. They are fighting for something far greater than that. They are attempting to maintain the Nation to which they want to return.

True, what we propose here is not sufficient to maintain a family in luxury. The social workers say it is sufficient to constitute the family maintenance level. It is based upon what they regard as being sufficient to maintain a family not in luxury, it is true, but in decency and in health.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss one aspect of this bill that I think is a little different approach than anyone has taken today. In considering a bill of this kind I think there are two primary things to take into account. One is, What is the cost of living of the people whom we are trying to benefit? How much does it cost them to live? Does this bill give them enough to maintain that standard of living?

The other question is, Is there any discrimination practiced by the operation of the bill? I believe there is distinct discrimination practiced by the way this bill operates upon the people who receive its benefits. This is why I say that.

The opportunity to volunteer in the Army is gone. Everybody that goes into the armed forces now is taken under the Selective Service Act. It is my opinion that when a man is deferred by the operation of the Selective Service Act that is virtually the same as selecting him to do some kind of industrial or necessary nonmilitary work in the war effort.

Let us see how this operates. How does this work? The men who are deferred go into war plants. We know that the great bulk of workers in America today outside of the farmers are working in war plants. My area is a good one to take as an illustration. These men under governmental edict and by governmental permission are getting very high wages. I do not begrudge them high wages. They are doing important work. But remember, they are living at home, they can stay with their wives and their children, and their lives are not disordered. They can plan their lives. In other words, they are carrying on about as they did in ordinary civil pursuits. They are performing important work, we realize that, but their lives have not changed much because of the fact that they are now engaged in war work and before that were engaged in other kinds of work. Neither the family nor the man who is deferred for war work by the selective-service law suffers any material inconvenience because of his deferment for war work. Also, their actual net pay in most cases is higher than it was before.

Let us look at the man across the street, of the same age and similar physique, with a family. He is taken into the military service by the selective-service law. What happens to him and his family? He is taken away from home. His entire life is disordered. Neither he nor his family can plan for the future. He may be taken abroad, he may get into military combat, he may be maimed, he may be killed. His family does not have the benefit of his company or of his earning capacity. So I say when we take this man away we ought to try to

provide reasonably for his family and pay them enough to keep body and soul together while their loved one is away fighting to preserve the Republic.

In my judgment, the allotments provided in this bill are not reasonable, they are not sufficient, they do not meet the cost of living in the United States. My particular area borders on San Francisco Bay. I notice that the cost of living in San Francisco is the highest in the United States. I notice that all the 33 cities in which we have the millions of war workers show that their cost of living exceeds by about 20 percent what we allow in this bill for the wife, and a similar proportion as to the allowance for the children. It seems to me that if we want to be fair, if we want to do the right thing, we ought at least to take care of the women and children who remain here, not in a substantial manner but in an adequate way, in view of the increased cost of living. The tables on which we base the conclusion of the inadequacy of our proposed allowances to dependents were supplied by the statistical bureau of the Labor Department.

I have the utmost affection for our chairman, and I hate to differ with him on this matter, although I must. It has been mentioned here by him and others that we should take the average cost of living as a basis. Do you not see what that will do to us? It means that a great segment of our population, perhaps half of them, will be given an allowance, a subsistence pay, that will be below the actual cost of living in the place in which they live. This is so because the average is obtained by lumping together the low standard of living and the higher standard of living, and the cost thereof, and taking an average thereof. That is absolutely unfair. To make up the difference they will have to go on the relief rolls, they will have to go to friends, they will have to go to relatives, they will have to tap their little savings accounts and drain away the money which they have saved for a rainy day.

Remember, these particular persons are the ones that are making the greatest sacrifice of anybody in the war effort. They are the very ones that have to look to outside sources to maintain themselves in order to have the bare necessities of life.

The bill that I think is fair as a very minimum is the one suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]. I suggested an amendment of the identical nature during the committee meetings. In that bill we provide \$50 for the wife, \$30 for the first child, and \$20 for each additional child. If you look over the figures in the reports here and review the cost-of-living statistics, you will find that that is just barely enough to maintain a family in the United States in the great industrial war plant areas like Vallejo, Sacramento, Stockton, and San Francisco, Calif.

For instance, the figures show that in my area, the San Francisco Bay area, the cost of living as computed by the Department of Labor is \$1,807 a year for a family of four. Under the bill we sponsor, with this slight increase over the com-

mittee bill, they would get only \$120 a month; in other words, they would get \$30 a month below the actual cost of living in San Francisco, as computed by the Department of Labor. But those war workers in our area are receiving adequate pay to live under those conditions. Right in the same community are the very people whose sons and fathers have gone away to war, but whose allowance is far below the earnings of those who have not been sent away, with the attendant hazards and uncertainties.

Another matter that was mentioned here that requires some attention and some answer is this: The gentleman from Texas mentioned many benefits that men in the service get, and they do get some benefits. But remember that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act does not wipe out their obligation on the mortgages on their homes and on their notes and their papers. It merely suspends the payment thereon. Neither does it wipe out the interest. For instance, a \$3,000 note a serviceman might have every year that he is away accumulates \$180 in interest, which he must pay back within 12 months after his discharge, unless a court grants him an extension.

So, in every way, I say that this bill does not measure up to the requirements that I think a bill of this kind should. It does not meet the cost of living in the great cities and the war areas of this country where millions and millions of men are working, and where we have also side by side with the war workers hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of widows, and the children of service workers; it does not meet the challenge that is ours that we should pass laws that do not discriminate in their operation, for I believe the operation of this law and the facts that men who are selected by this law are taken by the Selective Service Act and that that act also selects men for the armed forces make its operation clearly discriminatory.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may not have understood the gentleman correctly, but I am sure that he wants the Record to speak the truth. I understood him to say that insurance payments that were made by the Government or guaranteed by the Government had to be paid back by the insured within 12 months after discharge.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I made no comment on insurance. I made a comment on promissory notes on which the interest is merely suspended and the payment suspended for the duration of the war, to 1 year thereafter, and I did say that in those cases all that accruing interest must be paid by the serviceman when he comes back. I made no comment upon insurance payments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It must not necessarily be paid within 12 months. He can go into court with reference to any kind of indebtedness that may accrue and have the court work out an amortization

plan for him. I would not want the country to get the idea that we are going to have a great amount of debt piled on these servicemen that they have to pay within 12 months.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Oh, no. The law provides it must be done within 12 months, or he may make legal arrangements, but he does not have any of his debts or any of his interest wiped out. I do admit that the court may give an extension of time to pay them, but the burden will be rather heavy to make up these back payments, plus accrued interest.

We see then that the very act, that is, Selective Service Act, which selects men for the military force is the one that also virtually places and holds men who are subject to military service, in war industry by granting them deferment from military service.

The first group of men receive small pay, although no one is now objecting to their pay schedule. Their dependents are given allowances and allotments to take care of themselves because the man who supports them has been taken away. At the same time the family of the man who is deferred have their source of support (father, husband, brother) intact. He is working and drawing good wages, which have been fixed by Government in most instances.

The very group who make the greatest sacrifice, both physically, socially, and financially we do the least for. The wives and children and mothers of these men should be given enough to enable them to get the bare necessities of life without going to the relief agencies or becoming the victims of the generosity of friends or relatives. Under the committee bill I know the payments will not be adequate to maintain most of the dependents in my district at the present cost of living in that area. Consequently, we should raise it to the amount suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]. That is the very minimum that will enable these people to live adequately. The defenders of the Republic, who are willing to lay down their lives for our country, have a right to expect that from their Government.

It seems obvious to me that the very operation of this proposed law will constitute a grave discrimination against the dependents of our men in the military service. The only way to correct this discrimination is to give as a minimum the amounts suggested in the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McCORD].

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Chairman, if this were a controversial question I would forego an engagement I have which takes me out of town on Monday, but since it is not, and since the country looks on this with as much interest as any legislation that will be presented here during this war in which we are engaged,

I do want to stand here and be on record as favoring wholeheartedly the bill before the Committee.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, as we move further into this war we realize more and more the sacrifices which, often times unexpectedly, must be made by our people. The present war is the greatest struggle which the human race has ever seen, and we have reached the point in the mobilization of our resources, as our Selective Service headquarters tells us, that the induction of fathers on a large scale is imminent. Those of us who have given the matter much thought realize what this means to the Nation. It means the establishment of an additional large class of persons, namely, children of servicemen, who will be dependent upon the United States Government and for whom we will feel an obligation for perhaps the next 100 years. At this point we feel that a revision of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act, which we passed in 1942, is necessary so as to more adequately take care of the new group of dependents which will shortly, in large numbers, become in effect wards of the United States Government.

In 1942 we passed the first Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act, in effect blazing a path for legislation of this character. Prior to that time enlisted men in the armed services could make an allotment to dependents, but the entire sum allotted came out of the pay of the soldier, the sailor, or the marine. The purpose of the initial act, which purpose is adhered to in the present legislation, is to so supplement the pay of the enlisted man that those who had been dependent upon him at home would not suffer from want while he was in the armed services. This is a proper obligation of the United States Government to take care of the loved ones of the Nation's defenders, and this purpose certainly contributes toward the raising of the morale of the men in service, as well as to the efficiency and operation of the Army itself.

This bill provides for three classes of dependents, namely, class A, class B, and class B-1. In the category of class A dependents it permits the allotment to a wife to remain at \$50; to a wife with one child it raises the allotment to \$75; to a wife and two children it raises the allotment to \$95, and permits payment of an additional \$15 for each additional child. This is a considerable increase for the children of men in the armed service and should help a great deal toward paying the heavy expenses the wife of the serviceman must sustain in caring for her family in the absence of the father.

Class B dependents, as described in the original Servicemen's Dependents Allotment Act, is now divided into two parts known as class B dependents and class B-1 dependents. The class B dependents include any parent, grandchild, brother, or sister who is found to be dependent upon the enlisted man for a

substantial portion of his support. The class B-1 dependents include any parent, brother, or sister who is found to be dependent upon the enlisted man for the chief portion of his support. Allotment shall not be paid to dependents in both class B and class B-1 for the same serviceman.

One of the unfortunate things under the law is that a grandchild partially dependent upon a serviceman may receive support, while a grandchild wholly dependent upon a serviceman under this act will receive no help at all. Therefore, when we come to this particular provision, it is my purpose to offer an amendment to correct that inequity which I think will be recognized by everyone.

One of the greatest problems which concerned the committee in drafting this bill was that of dealing with a wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a decree of court or a written agreement. In such cases, it is extremely difficult to be entirely fair to the enlisted man who makes a contribution and at the same time work substantial justice in favor of the estranged or divorced wife. In finally deciding this matter the committee provided that the allowance to the wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man should not exceed the order or decree of the court or the written agreement previously existing. Another important change in the law, with which I am not altogether in sympathy, is that which requires an enlisted man in such a case to pay the entire amount of any allotment made under this subsection out of his own meager earnings should the allotment to the estranged or divorced wife be less than \$22 per month.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman understand that this bill provides that the amounts specified in the bill are to take precedence over any court order which may be made in this country for support of the child of divorced parents?

Mr. BROOKS. That is my understanding.

It has not been an easy job to so standardize the needs of the families of these men (and women also, as the families of WAC's, WAVES, and other women's service organizations are included in this act) that no injustices may be done to various groups of dependents which we feel to be truly in need of help, and at the same time be fair with the taxpayers of the Nation who are paying the cost. Each group of dependents has its own special appeal to the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, and each group has had its reasons for claiming some increase or some adjustment in the amounts paid. Those which I think reached down into the hearts of the members of the committee as being worthy of every consideration were the children of the men who go out and offer their lives for the Nation in this war. The committee felt that no amount of money would in fact be adequate for the sacrifices which these youngsters are making in giving their fathers to the service in these perilous times, but we have sought to establish rates of pay that will provide for their necessities and their current needs even during the period of high prices to which we are going.

Much of this act is very technical in its nature. We have studied the manner in which the original act has been administered, realizing as we do the tremendous job which Congress has placed upon the Allotment and Allowance Division of the War Department. The figures on this matter are very illuminating, and I believe will be most interesting to you. General Gilbert, who heads this division, testified that about 3,900,000 applications for allotments have been received by his office, and that there is in effect at this time 2,800,000 applications upon which current monthly payments are being made. While it was testified that approximately \$2,225,000,000 have been paid out in allotments, it is only fair to state that this figure includes all allotments and for all purposes, many of which were voluntarily made by the serviceman without Government contribution. In the category of allotments toward which the Government makes a contribution, the hearings disclose that the War Department in the last 14 months has paid out a total of \$1,053,409,398.16, and the soldier has contributed roughly 44 cents out of each dollar paid to these dependents. In other words, out of the total paid, the Government has contributed \$593,000,000 while the soldier out of his meager pay has contributed \$465,000,000. These figures alone give some idea of the Herculean job which the War Department is handling in the field of the dependents of the enlisted man.

General Gilbert, who handles this work, testified that the average allotment is now being processed in about 5 days, and, judging by the mail which I receive from my own area, I am satisfied that the Division of Allotments and Allowances of the War Department is doing a magnificent job. This Department is handling this work with dispatch and without delay; it is handling it in such a way as to relieve suffering and distress throughout the Nation, and General Gilbert is entitled to receive the gratitude and appreciation of this Congress for handling a very technical law in a most businesslike and practical way.

As we proceed with this debate, in passing upon the amendments, I hope that this body will not lose sight of the fact that the bill is very technical in its nature and is balanced one part against the other. While personally I would like to see one or two amendments adopted, I do not want to see such changes in the bill as will throw it completely out of adjustment, the one section with the other. I believe it is a good bill which will relieve hardship, suffering, and want among those near and dear to our men in service, and I hope then it will pass by a unanimous vote.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include a newspaper editorial.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to ask special permission in the House to include the newspaper editorial. Is there objection to the request of the

gentleman to revise and extend his remarks?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] expressed a desire which we all have. It is his idea, and that thought has been expressed many times before in the House, that the Congress should make provision for all those who are dependent upon the men who fight our battles and who are in service. It is just unfortunate that adequate provision cannot be made for all of them. That is one of the penalties of war. It is my intention to go along with any bill which is introduced for the appropriation of money for these dependents. That may not be a sound policy, but the excuse for following it is this, that if we are not bankrupt now, we will be before we are through with the New Deal. I voted for the soldiers' bonus not because I thought we could stand it, not because I thought it was a good policy, but because it was my opinion that the administration intended to spend every dollar it could put its fingers on.

I believed then, as I believe today, that any dollar that can find its way into the pocket of an American serviceman or any man or woman who is dependent upon him is just a dollar saved for an American, instead of being spent somewhere else.

To digress, it is my opinion, after listening to the testimony of the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Bard, before the House Committee on Naval Affairs, that it is time the politicians in this administration did a little something for the men who are doing the actual fighting while Congress is trying to take care of their dependents.

BREWSTER AERONAUTICAL CORPORATION—A MONUMENT TO POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY—A NIGHTMARE TO THE TAXPAYER

The Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, Tom DeLorenzo and the leadership which he represents—not the individual employees who belong to his union—might well be viewed as monuments to the memory of the loyalty owed to the American taxpayer by the Administration and to the duty owed to the American fighting men by labor leaders, for both lie buried at Brewster.

This administration, carrying on a world-wide war, is under a solemn obligation to see to it that every dollar contributed by the hard-pressed American taxpayer is economically spent and that every dollar brings forth the utmost in production. The administration having failed in this duty, it now devolves upon the shoulders of the Republican minority in Congress.

The men who are fighting our battle all over the world have the right to demand that every American worker remaining here at home, every labor leader, do his utmost to furnish the munitions of war, including planes, which the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation is supposed to be making.

Every thinking individual knows that the munitions of war, and especially planes, must be supplied to those in the battle line in the quantity and at the

time when needed, and that, at times, even a few minutes' delay in the arrival of a plane may mean the loss of American lives.

This being true, there is—there can be—no excuse for the failure of any American, either in management or on the production line, to render his full measure of service.

The overwhelming number, both in management and on the assembly line, are doing just that thing. Only a few—a very few—fail to realize the tragic result which follows inefficiency or loafing on the job.

The man who in the service willfully fails to bring up needed supplies to the men in the battle line would be shot, and the man, either in management or in a responsible position in a labor organization, who deliberately, either for profit or to advance his political position with the union, delays production should be exposed and ostracized by every decent American.

From the well of the House, on the 27th of April 1942, that human dynamo from Michigan, our colleague, ALBERT ENGEL, who has so often conducted a one-man investigation exposing those who were failing to wholeheartedly support the war effort, called attention to the fact that the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation had paid to Alfred and I. J. Miranda and F. William Zelcer, under a contract made by that corporation, \$5,400,000 as commissions. The two Mirandas also received, as pointed out by our colleague, \$250,000 as a commission from the Hayes Aircraft Accessories Corporation, which they and Zelcer formed while they were in jail.

Our colleague demanded and secured the cancellation of that contract. But that did not wholly remedy the situation. From that day down to the present moment, the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation has been used as a vehicle to rob the taxpayer and advance the political fortunes of Tom DeLorenzo, president of CIO United Automobile Workers Local No. 365, at the Brewster plant.

The administration has placed the Navy in charge of this corporation and there have been successive changes of management, a part of the story having been placed in the RECORD on October 4, 1943, on pages 8046 to 8051.

On October 13 one of the Washington papers carried a story headlined "Labor problems at Brewster already eased, Kaiser says." The story contains the statement by DeLorenzo, who said:

Yesterday Mr. Kaiser and I visited all the Brewster plants in Long Island City. The trip was most productive in that we both agreed that it was absolutely essential that we both, almost as one family, give our utmost to the Navy in its efforts to produce the greatest number of planes. I am convinced that the absolute cooperation between the Navy, management and ourselves, acting as one unit, can and will get excellent results. Discussions between Mr. Kaiser and myself threw new light upon the situation, which makes it clearly evident that my paramount duty under the present war conditions is to support the Navy and the Kaiser management, and do everything within my power to be useful. I am certain that every one of the Brewster employees and myself will take this position.

If Mr. DeLorenzo made that statement in good faith and if he intends to, and does, carry it out, that is all to the good, and the taxpayer may expect value for his dollar; the soldier, the sailor, the Marine, the men in the air corps, the loyal support to which they are entitled.

Too much faith cannot be placed in DeLorenzo's statements. It was only a few days ago that, speaking of the policy of the union which he represents, he said: "Our policy is not to win the war at any cost," and then continued with statements to the effect that the production of planes would be delayed unless management and the Navy complied with union demands, as expressed by DeLorenzo.

Unfortunately, however, at the instance of the Navy, controlled as it is by Administration politicians who from time to time overrule the decisions of Navy officials who would bring about production, managements, because of DeLorenzo's activities, have come and gone, while he has remained supreme and in control of union activities.

No one who is familiar with the situation at Brewster doubts for one moment but that the overwhelming majority of the workers desire the opportunity to render full measure of service and would give it, were it not for the demands of a few who will always, for one reason or another or for no reason at all, hinder production.

While the management has from time to time been changed, DeLorenzo has continued in power. It would have been far better if the Navy, when it took over control and insisted upon a change in management, would have kicked DeLorenzo out. But that, there is reason to believe, was not done because of the political hookup with prominent New York politicians.

The old contract between management and the union still remains in force and no one, not even Kaiser, can make the plant fully productive if that contract continues and union activities which have heretofore prevailed are longer permitted.

Note this section of the 1942 contract, which, although it has expired by limitation of time is, under the direction of the Navy, still in force from month to month. The provision, from page 10, under management, section 4, reads:

The company may discipline or discharge any employee for just and proper cause, except that before any employee is disciplined or discharged, there shall be a hearing and mutual agreement between the shop committee and a representative or representatives of the management appointed for such hearings. The decision, if mutually agreed upon, shall be final and binding upon both parties.

The joker lies in the four words, "if mutually agreed upon," in the last sentence of that paragraph, which reads: "The decision, if mutually agreed upon, shall be final and binding upon both parties."

Under that section of the contract, DeLorenzo has been in absolute control of the manpower problem at Brewster. He has so exercised that power as to prevent management and the Navy from

getting full production. He has exercised it in such a tyrannical and dictatorial manner that the loyal workers in the factory dare not, because of fear of him, give full measure of production to the company, their Government, and the men they have sent to the front.

Proof of this is found in the fact that, time and again, when management has given orders; when the Navy, through its officers, has given directions, they have been flouted, ridiculed, and disobeyed by those under DeLorenzo's protection.

Let me cite just one instance.

During the week of June 21, 1943, a foreman in one department at the Johnsville plant discharged three women for loitering. The three women had been reprimanded the previous week for the same offense. None belonged to the union. All three were serving the usual 60-day probationary period provided for in the union contract before becoming members of the union. They not being members of the union, under the contract the company could discharge them at any time, for the union had no jurisdiction over the matter.

The three women had attended a union meeting the night before they were discharged, and members of the union claimed that they were discharged because they had attended a union meeting, and thus the union was discriminated against. That charge was not true.

On Thursday of that week, the union stewards went through the shop and ordered the employees to quit work at 4:30 p. m. and not to work overtime. That would have resulted in a 40-hour week.

The employees did quit at 4:30 on Thursday afternoon and the shop committee, on Friday, told the management that, regardless of the fact that the discharged employees were not members of the union, they would not stand for employees working more than 8 hours a day, 40 hours a week, on regular pay. The dispute was settled by the reemployment of the three discharged employees.

Some of the employees, stenographers, did not go out at 4:30 p. m., as ordered by the union. Later, the union wrote some of the stenographers, telling them that charges had been preferred against them for not leaving work at the specified time of 4:30 p. m. on Thursday, June 24, 1943. They were then ordered to appear before the trial board to answer those charges.

Later, the union agreed to withdraw the charges, but the employees were required to appear and they did appear and they were fined \$50 each. When the attention of the union officials was called to the fact that they had agreed to withdraw the charges, the union officials then claimed that the stenographers were not fined for not leaving work at 4:30, but because they did not speak to another girl who did leave at 4:30 p. m.

It is evident that those stenographers who did not walk out at the request of the union officials were fined by the union for not obeying orders. They stayed to aid in making bombers and fighters for the men who had gone to the front. They obeyed the management and the Navy, both of which were seeking production, and because they did, because

they violated the order of the union to walk out, they were fined.

What action, may I ask, was taken against those who walked out—virtually a strike—in violation of the Smith-Connally Act?

A man who remained at his job, in defiance of a union strike, was suspended for 30 days.

Guards, who had taken an oath to support the Government, violated that oath, defied the orders of the Navy, were sentenced by a court martial, but DeLorenzo had enough political pull with this administration to nullify the sentence.

Other instances might be cited, and it is hoped that the subcommittee of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, which is investigating this situation, will dig them up and lay the facts on the record.

THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM

We are asked, What is the remedy? It is plain and simple.

The Government has poured millions of dollars into this plant, which is not giving even a decent percentage of production in return.

The people who work there—many of them—men and women in the assembly line, at the production machines, engineers and technical workers, are ashamed of the fact that they work at Brewster's, and they are ashamed of the production record of Brewster.

One of two things should be done. The Government should either write off the loss and close the plant, or it should abrogate the contract now existing between the union and management, place someone with absolute authority in charge of the plant, and open up the jobs in the plant, from janitor and floor sweeper to the top technical men, to all Americans who want to work to support the war effort, and this regardless of membership in any union.

If Brewster can be made to produce, there is a valid objection to a cancellation of the Government contract with it and junking the plant.

James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, appearing before the Subcommittee of the House, Naval Affairs, on October 13, stressed the Government's vital need of every single plane it could procure. He admitted that, as a business proposition, the Government's experience with Brewster had been and now is bad, but in substance he said that in spite of the high cost, in spite of weak management, in spite of labor trouble, the Government had continued to hope that Brewster would do better and had continued its contract with them.

He said that the Government had invested nine million in the plant and had loaned Brewster fifty-five million more. The substance of his statement in that respect was that it was only because of the dire need for planes that the Government continued its effort to get them from Brewster.

It was clear from his testimony that there was no other place where the planes could be produced. It is equally clear to those who know the facts that they are not being produced at Brewster

and that they will not be produced as long as the present manpower situation is controlled by Tom DeLorenzo.

What the Under Secretary did not explain was the reason why certain high officials in the Government refused to give support to Brewster management but went along with Tom DeLorenzo in his obstructive tactics.

The situation never will be remedied, the troubles at Brewster never will be solved by Kaiser or anyone else, until the Navy turns over to management, whoever that may be, the problems that belong to management.

Certainly production cannot be had when the manpower is under the domination of a man who thinks first, as has DeLorenzo, of union rules, union activities, the advancement of labor politicians, rather than of production.

This administration in a day could break the dictatorial power of Tom DeLorenzo and others like him who, by slowing down production or transportation—as in the present strike in the South, where 10,000 teamsters are refusing to haul merchandise needed in the war; or the strike on the west coast, where 2,000 carloads of freight jammed the shipping yards—are lessening the fighting ability of our men who every day are giving full measure of service—yes, even to loss of life itself—to preserve the Government which is giving these men jobs, if an end were made to the closed shop; to the maintenance of security-of-membership contracts, to the contracts, under whatever name they may be called, which deny, in violation of the provisions of our Constitution, the right of every man not only to earn a livelihood, but to work in defense of his Government.

Cancel the present contract between the union and Brewster Aeronautical Corporation; throw the plant open to every man who wants a job, and the power of Tom DeLorenzo to interfere with the efficiency of the Navy and the Army will be destroyed.

The solution of the trouble at Brewster rests with the administration, which clings like a bulldog to its corrupt political alliance with labor politicians.

We know that the C. I. O. at a convention recently endorsed the President for a fourth term, but that endorsement is too high a price to pay for the continuation of a policy which denies to our men who are fighting and dying day after day the planes which they must have if this war is to be won.

Once more I call attention to the fact—and it is a fact—that the fourth-term campaign is standing in the way of all-out production.

The President can call the Senators who attempted to give us the facts from the fighting fronts "fellow travelers" if he wishes, but he and labor politicians are fellow travelers along the road which so far, in the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation at least, has been reducing production of planes so vitally needed by the Navy.

The administration and its political cohorts having made a mess at Brewster, having wasted the taxpayers' money, having failed to get production there, the

Republican minority should have the courage to solve the problem.

It was my privilege to hear the testimony of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Ralph A. Bard given before the House Subcommittee on Naval Affairs.

No one would venture for a moment to question the courage of the men who are on the battle front with the fighting naval forces, nor would anyone question the willingness to serve of the other personnel of the Navy who for one reason or the other are compelled to serve in non-combat areas. Nor would any true American with knowledge of the situation fail to condemn the actions and decisions of the politicians, who at the top of our Navy, direct its policies.

As was pointed out yesterday, Undersecretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal stressed the dire need of the Navy for bombers and for fighters. It was evident from his testimony that our men may be dying because of lack of production at the Brewster plants; that our war effort is being slowed down and the day of ultimate victory delayed.

As has been pointed out, he said that, in spite of the high cost, the weak management and labor troubles, which had so seriously interfered with production at Brewster, the need of the Navy was so great, the ability to procure planes elsewhere so slight, that the Navy had continued its contract with Brewster in the hope that the situation would be remedied.

Today, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Ralph A. Bard testified. It is evident from his testimony that, while the management has been weak; while it has frequently been changed by the administration, the manpower situation has during this period of underproduction or non-production been under the control of Tom DeLorenzo and that never has the Navy taken any steps to change that situation by the removal of DeLorenzo. DeLorenzo, as has been shown repeatedly, is the man who places the welfare of his union above the production of planes.

Bard, when his attention was called to that fact and to the failure of the Navy to act, said in substance that DeLorenzo had dictatorial power over the members of his union. It was apparent from Bard's testimony that the security guards, who are supposed to protect the plant, when the pinch came gave allegiance to and obeyed the orders of their union, instead of obeying the orders given by the Navy.

Bard attempted to excuse the disobedient guards and said that their sentences were lessened because, as Bard said, it was thought they did not understand their duty or the obligation which they owed to the Navy.

Of course, these men obeyed the orders of their union leaders and Tom DeLorenzo is directly responsible for this lack of production, for the disobedience of the guards. But Bard admitted that the Navy had not taken action to remedy the situation, although the remedy—the removal of DeLorenzo—is apparent. Why not cite DeLorenzo for sedition?

The Navy is about to meet in combat, either on or under the sea or in the air,

the picked fighters of Japan and Germany, and we have no fear of the result; but it cannot, or will not, and that is Bard's confession, meet Tom DeLorenzo in Philadelphia at the plant of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation and from him win a victory.

If there is anything more disheartening to the fighting forces in the Navy than this humiliating admission on the part of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Bard, I do not know what it can be. However, there is a precedent for it.

You will recall that as long ago as 1939, the then Acting Secretary of the Navy, Edison, followed a similar course and for 42 days surrendered to the C. I. O. of Detroit.

When will the administration forget political expediency; insist upon an all-out war effort?

Bard and Forrestal are in charge, ostensibly at least, although from the testimony of Mr. Bard, I suspect that over and above him, hampering him and staying his hand, is a master politician who is in on the deal through which support is given to labor politicians at the expense of the prosecution of the war.

The testimony shows that four of those guards disobeyed the orders of the Navy. They were court-martialed and sentenced. The sentence was set aside and those same four men, according to the papers yesterday, are back at work in that plant. Now, Bard excuses them by saying that they did not understand the enormity of their offense. All right. He says they only followed orders. Again I say all right. But if he is going to excuse those four men then he should get the man who incited them to stop production and to disobey the orders of the Navy.

Now, what is the use of appropriating billions of dollars? Why appropriate money for the dependents of those who go to war and do the fighting, when down here at the other end of the Avenue in their offices sit men who condone, who do not remedy, the conditions which prevent men who are giving their lives every day all over the world from having the planes that they need? I ask you in all sincerity and in all good faith how long are you going to stand by those two high officials of the Navy? Bard expressing his personal opinion said, in substance, he would not stand for it if he could have his way.

Both Bard and Forrestal know that Brewster is not producing; that it has not produced. Change in management, without a change in the Navy's policy, gives no assurance of production.

Bard and Forrestal should either change their policy or they should resign, or they should be removed from office. If in their case there is the same reason for a failure to perform their duty that applied to the case of the four Coast Guard guards who disobeyed orders and were court-martialed, then they may be excused for failure to follow a course which would insure production.

It is obvious, and they know, that the real trouble at Brewster lies at the door of Tom DeLorenzo. All they need to do to end the intolerable situation is to can-

cel the contract with Brewster, take charge of the plant, install management and throw open the doors to patriotic workers, regardless of union membership. Make the place an open shop and patriotic Americans, if protected in their right to work, will work, not only because of the high wages, but because they are patriotic and because they want to produce planes.

There is no reason in the world why the production of fighters which are needed this very minute on the fighting fronts should be held up until American citizens have complied with the orders of, paid the various sums demanded by, Tom DeLorenzo or any other man.

If Bard and Forrestal cannot follow that kind of a policy because of orders from someone higher up, then Congress should follow that line back to its source and remove or impeach the individuals, whoever they may be, who are sabotaging our war effort.

It is reported now that Mr. DeLorenzo has promised that he will no longer sabotage the production of planes. Now, that is fine. Presumably the Government, until he changes his mind, may go ahead, with his permission, and make fighters for MacArthur and others who need them.

My remedy would be to kick Tom DeLorenzo not only out of the plant, not only out of the picture, but into some country where his ideas will not be so destructive of national unity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, about fourscore years ago, within 200 feet of this Chamber where we are convened today, Abraham Lincoln stood on the steps of this Capitol and advised the people of his day and time: "to care for him who shall have borne the battle, his widow and his orphans."

Today we have convened for the consideration of a bill to provide not only for the three classes of people that he mentioned in his remarks in his second inaugural address on March 4, 1865, but to include another class and that is the dependents of the men who are wearing the uniform of our country. To the Committee on Military Affairs and its able chairman we all pay our tribute of respect for the very great care and consideration that they have devoted to this difficult and complex problem. No matter how carefully they have planned and presented this bill to the House, undoubtedly inequities, inequalities, and injustice will appear sooner or later.

I join with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] in the statement that he made earlier this afternoon when he pointed out, regardless of what those in this body might think, that a more liberal sum should be provided, that one of the things necessary to protect the men who wear the uniform of our country is that they might come back to a country and to a Government which is still solvent and able

to meet its obligations to them and their dependents. Therefore, I join with the committee and the other Members of this House in voicing my approval of this bill for a reasonable and adequate program devoted to taking care of and providing for the dependents of the men fighting our Nation's battles.

I received a letter from the friend of the court, and by that I mean the circuit court for the County of Oakland, at Pontiac, Mich., within the congressional district which I have the honor to represent in this Chamber, pointing out some of the difficulties that he, as friend of the court, and charged with the responsibility of looking after the dependents and the children of divorced people, is confronted with from day to day. With the permission of the committee I want to read into the Record a few excerpts from this letter, which will point out some of the problems involved in the question of allotments to dependents of men in the armed service. This letter is dated October 11, just a few days ago, and I quote:

I can see no justice in giving to a wife \$50 a month when that wife is perhaps working either in a Government job or in civilian work at \$50 or more per week from which she should be self-sustaining.

You will remember that I asked the able chairman of the committee a question earlier in the day whether or not these allotments to wives are on the basis of need. He replied that they were not. This bill provides that it is mandatory and is granted to all alike, rich and poor, regardless of whether there is need or not.

Quoting further from this letter:

Many of the women married a soldier so that they can get that allotment and then give little or no regard to their marital status after the soldier has been inducted into service.

In some instances the office of Dependency Benefits has reduced the small monthly payments previously allotted to the soldiers' children after the soldier has remarried in order that they can keep up the \$50 per month and thereby build up the morale of the new wife so that the husband would make a better soldier if he felt he had home ties through a wife who was pulling for him while in service.

It is not for me to dictate to you and the Congress what amount shall be allotted for a mother and children a soldier has divorced and left to shift for themselves while he goes into service and then marries some other woman. However, I have the problem to face every day and if I can assist in doing something that will bring about justice for these children, I feel it my duty as a citizen to speak through you. Our tax burden is increasing already by leaps and bounds, and the additional annual cost of over \$650,000,000, estimated by this amendment is a large sum for the overburdened taxpayers to have to assume. However, as a taxpayer I am not opposing the additional burden, but do ask for a reduction in the original act and the elimination in the increase in the proposed act of wives who have recently married the soldier, and especially where they are employed as Government employees or in civilian defense work at \$20 per week or more.

I also ask due consideration in the amended act for the divorced children of a

soldier, and that the allotment to them be the maximum amount paid for the support of the child or any wife of any soldier.

Personally I feel that the act should apply to every man in the armed services, be he a private or high ranking officer. Some of the men who have risen to the rank of commissioned officers have cut off the allotment for support of their families as soon as they received a commissioned officer's salary, and there is no way whereby a soldier can be compelled to pay for the support of his dependent children until he returns to civil life.

These observations come from a public official who meets the problems of allotments in his official capacity first hand and knows what he is talking about.

Every consideration should be given to the abuses pointed out by him. It is the plain duty of a grateful people to provide reasonably for the dependents of those who fight the Nation's wars.

I shall vote for the committee bill reported to the House and urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is the second time in almost 10 months of this Congress that I have risen to speak my mind on pending legislation, and I want you all to feel sure that were it not for the fact that this legislation affects me and the people of my district very seriously, I would hesitate to speak now. This legislation affects me and the people of my district very seriously for two reasons:

First of all I have to laugh up my sleeve every time I hear the statement made to the effect that the drafting of fathers is imminent. For example, in the debates which lasted for days in the Senate there were arguments as to whether we should or should not draft fathers after October 1, 1943.

I wonder how many people realize they have been drafting the fathers in my district for the last 18 months—1 year and 6 months they have been drafting fathers in my district. But the debate still went on. Therefore there are many people in my district affected by the pending legislation perhaps more so than the people of any other district. Let me give you some figures.

In the county in which my home is located, 15 percent of the population of that county today is in the armed forces of the United States of America. For the 14 counties that I represent, 12 percent of the population of those 14 counties is already in the armed forces of the United States of America. In many cases we have fathers with as many as 4 or 5 or 6 children, in my district, already in the armed forces of the United States of America.

If the draft figures were prorated throughout the entire country as they are in my district, we would have a standing army today of 15,600,000 men; and for my particular county, if these statistics were prorated through the entire county to the draft-per-capita population we have in my home county, we would have a standing army today of 22,000,000 men. My district has a very

large percentage of its men in armed forces who are married and have families.

I am interested in this bill for another reason. In the last mail that I have read I have received this letter and this is typical of the many problems I am getting, and the biggest source of worry to me is this matter of dependency allotments. Let me read from this letter I got in my last mail:

I've been in the Army almost 4 months, as you know. My dad is blind, my mother is in ill health, and I have a daughter. My wife stayed at home to try and take care of the folks, but there's no work around Ironwood and Hurley, so she worked 3 nights a week at the Iron Inn. I never knew this until recently. You can understand my views on that. I also have learned that they haven't received 1 cent of allotment money since I have been gone. By they I mean my wife and daughter. Each pay day it was taken out of my pay but no money was received at home. My wife and I finally borrowed a few dollars and we arrived out here where I hope she can get work. Once again we are just about out of cash, and unless something is done soon it will be tough.

Here is a blind father, a disabled mother, a wife, and a daughter dependent on this soldier for aid. How can all these live on \$62 per month? This is typical of the many cases I am getting. It takes time to solve them. I have no complaint to make about the local liaison office of the dependency bureau. They have been most fair with every case, but it takes time. In this particular case I have just got off the long-distance telephone. This case was so typical, in fact so pitiful, that I have just returned from the Western Union telegraph office where I wired him a sum of money. This is the forty-fourth case where I have dug down in my own pocket to help these people who have been so destitute. I mention this case not in criticism of the administration of dependency allotments—but I do offer this case to show how inadequate the law is for providing for those who depend on the men who are giving their lives for us.

This bill clears up a lot of the difficulties encountered by the present law. The Dependency Allotment Division has a mammoth job on its hands. The proposed bill removes some of the obstacles and will enable the Dependency Allotment Division to expedite its work.

I think this bill we are considering is a good one. Personally, I hope we will adopt the Sadowski amendment. I think the maximum he proposes is the amount that ought to be passed. I am seriously concerned about this legislation. I think it ought to have the unanimous approval of each and every Member of this House. We will certainly be doing nothing more than justice if we pass it and we shall certainly place ourselves in a position to be denounced if we do not take such action.

It will certainly be helpful to the people of my district. We have no defense plants there where dependents could secure employment as is the case in many districts. Wives and children and mothers of my district must have increased allotments to carry on. The fact that many fathers in my district have al-

ready been drafted makes this legislation from my point of view most imperative. I plead with each and every Member of this House to support this bill with the Sadowski amendment—which in my judgment is the fairest allotment of any offered thus far.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a radio speech by the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN, on the sponge-iron process of making steel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MUST WE WIN THE WAR IN 3 YEARS OR QUIT BUILDING AIRSHIPS FOR LACK OF ALUMINUM?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called to the attention of the House the critical situation we are facing in the production of aluminum for airplanes. No one responsible for the prosecution of the war fails to realize that without airplanes we cannot win the war and without aluminum we cannot have airplanes. Many of you, no doubt, do not realize that our own supply of bauxite in the United States, from which aluminum is made, is being rapidly exhausted and within some 3 years may be completely exhausted. We will then be dependent entirely on foreign importations. We have been getting our foreign supply from Dutch and British Guiana in South America, where a considerable portion of our raw material is now being secured. Our only local supply of high-grade bauxite—in Arkansas—is dwindling, and if the war lasts over 3 years, according to experts we will be completely at the mercy of foreign governments for our supply and the ability to keep our sea lanes open for importing bauxite from 2,500 to 3,000 miles from South America.

One-third of our aluminum is now being produced on the Pacific coast, largely

in the Columbia River area. This means a long railroad haul of 2,500 to 3,000 miles from Southern States, where bauxite is now reduced to alumina, to bring the alumina to the Pacific coast plants.

When the Federal Government took up the question of an aluminum supply early in the war these facts were canvassed and it was determined that it would be necessary to develop a supply of raw material from which alumina could be made within our own borders; otherwise, we would be subject to the hazard, if the war continues for some 2 or 3 years, of being completely out of aluminum for airplanes. Scientists were called in to study the problem and all of the available sources of raw material from which alumina could be made were surveyed, tested, and processes developed for utilizing these raw materials. Fortunately there are many huge deposits of clay throughout the United States, and particularly the west coast, which bear aluminum content and which scientific investigations have now disclosed are available and suitable as raw material from which to make alumina. Accordingly, the Federal Government, through appropriate agencies, adopted a program which covered the construction of five semicommercial or pilot plants for demonstrating conclusively the processes and the suitability of the respective clay deposits for use as a raw material. These five projects are as follows:

Kalunite, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah, alumina from alunite.

Aluminum, Inc., Marysville, Utah, alumina from alunite.

Columbia Metals, Pacific Northwest, alumina from clay.

Ancor Corporation, Harleyville, S. C., alumina from clay.

Monolith Midwest, Laramie, Wyo., alumina from anorthosite.

The first two of these projects have been constructed or now are under construction.

We on the Pacific coast are particularly interested in the Columbia Metals project to be located in the Northwest, where surveys, tests, and scientific investigations have been made determining the suitability of the several deposits of clay available. This project, after long and careful examination, was approved by the Alumina Committee of the War Production Board; the Young Coordinating Committee; the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board; the War Department, and preliminarily by the Defense Plant Corporation. When the project was ready for beginning construction, a stop order was issued, presumably based on the Byrnes directive and through the office of War Manpower Commission, on the alleged ground that manpower was not available and that there was a shortage of manpower on the Pacific coast and no new project should be initiated in that area. This objection was proven to be untenable.

At the previous hearing before Charles E. Wilson, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, it developed, however, that this so-called reason, lack of manpower, was not the real reason why the

project was stymied, but the stop order was issued because there was a sufficient supply of aluminum on hand or in sight to last some 3 years under present plans, and that the War Production Board did not deem it advisable as a war measure to permit the construction of this plant. It is admitted that if the plant is constructed, it would take a year or a year and a half, and it would employ only 300 men for construction, and if found successful it would take another year to construct operating plants of sufficient size to supply the necessary alumina for feeding the aluminum plants.

In other words, it would take 2½ years, if this program is followed out, to make the United States self-sufficient to meet our needs for aluminum to carry on the war. It was further demonstrated that the manpower problem was not involved because ample manpower is available in the territory where the plant will be constructed. These workers would not be taken from other war industries and are not available for other war work.

The whole matter is still pending before the Production Executive Committee composed of Charles E. Wilson, chairman; J. A. Krug, William L. Batt, G. H. Batchelor, Admiral Robinson, Admiral Vickery, Admiral Pace, General Clay, and General Echols. Representatives from the delegations in the Congress from Oregon, Washington, and Idaho have been heard by this committee, at a hearing where it was urged that the adverse decision canceling this program be reversed and that the green light be given for the immediate construction of the plants heretofore approved by the several boards to which I have called your attention.

A. H. Bunker, who is Director of the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board, the best informed Government official on the aluminum program, made a report to Charles E. Wilson, Vice Chairman of W. P. B., on September 3 last, urging that the action of the Board be reversed and the program be permitted to go forward immediately. I believe anyone who will take the time to read this memorandum of Mr. Bunker which was submitted for the consideration of the Production Executive Committee at our hearing, will be convinced that his conclusions were correct and that we are playing with fate, and jeopardizing the very success of the war on an ill-advised, indefensible policy in refusing to carry out a program to provide within our own territory for the necessary raw materials for the production of aluminum. As shown by Mr. Bunker's memorandum, which I will include in my remarks, within a very few years—perhaps 2 or 3—we will completely exhaust our own bauxite and be dependent upon importations from foreign sources. The submarine menace, which again is becoming most critical, may completely cut off our supply from South America, as was partially done in the beginning of this war, in the treacherous, submarine-infested waters of the Caribbean. Who can say we can win the war in 2 years, or 3 years, or when the war will end? Should we

adopt a program that depends on ending the war in 3 years or exhausting our aluminum for aircraft unless we can import sufficient raw material from foreign countries through 2,500 miles of submarine-infested waters?

Mr. Bunker's memorandum is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 3, 1943.

To: Mr. C. E. Wilson.

From: Mr. A. H. Bunker.

I am deeply disturbed by the minutes of the production executive committee meeting of September 1, which have just come to hand, insofar as they have voted to cancel out all of the projects for producing alumina from nonbauxitic domestic material and the balance of this program still under consideration. I believe this decision is a grave mistake.

The history leading up to the sponsorship of this program is a long and complex one, dating from almost the moment of my arrival in Washington in June of 1941. The very first step which I took upon arriving here was to cause a careful and thorough examination of domestic bauxite reserves to be made. It was immediately apparent that these reserves were inadequate to bear the full weight of a long and difficult war. The amount of high-grade ore, or that type of ore then regarded as commercial, was extremely limited, and even the lower grades of ore represented by no means extensive reserves. As soon as we had provided initial facilities for expanding the production of both alumina and aluminum by standard processes, we turned our attention to providing ways and means of successfully using all of the lower grade bauxite ores and also to developing and selecting those processes which would lend themselves to the recovery of alumina from nonbauxitic materials. We realized that this latter program would be a long and arduous one.

We enlisted the active help of the National Academy of Sciences, who immediately formed an alumina committee to devote itself to this problem. This work involved an examination of countless processes, recommendations, and suggestions for improving processes, pilot plant work under the direction of the war metallurgy committee largely at Government expense, and encouraging corporations not then engaged to enter into research work on clays, mine tailings, and many other available aluminous materials.

There was, of course, at that time no particular concern as to the safety of shipping in the Caribbean, as this had always been regarded by the Navy as highly defensible territory. However, we were very definitely concerned over the enormous requirements that might be placed upon shipping to conduct any large-scale war. We for that reason felt that every step should be taken to make this country entirely self-sufficient in supplying all of its necessary alumina from domestic raw materials, whether these were to be low-grade bauxites heretofore not used in the commercial production of alumina, or other nonbauxitic materials which we then knew to be extremely abundant.

As far as high-grade reserves of bauxite are concerned, they are being depleted with almost frightening rapidity; as far as the very low-grade reserves are concerned, we have not yet placed in operation our lime-soda-sinter facilities and therefore have no final proof of the degree of effectiveness of those facilities. In any event it is quite evident that another 2 years of war will so seriously deplete both high-grade and low-grade bauxite reserves that the rate of mining is likely to become sharply reduced to such an extent that the output of these ores may be quite inadequate to support the present aluminum system at full scale

operation. Short of ability to use domestic nonbauxitic raw materials this would immediately make us again dependent upon importation of foreign bauxite.

It is true that within recent months the Navy has suggested that conditions are very much easier due to substantial correction of the submarine menace and to the large amounts of merchant tonnage which are being constructed and put into service. Of course I am in no position to judge whether the correction of the submarine menace may or may not be of a temporary nature, and I am certainly not in the final position to judge whether those amounts of merchant tonnage which are now being put into service will all be needed to conduct future military campaigns or whether there will constantly remain a surplus available for the movement of very large tonnages of bauxite. I can only know that the pressure upon us has been constant to reduce imports throughout the entire last 2½ years. There has never been a suggestion that either the Navy or the War Shipping Administration would be willing to commit themselves to an adequate program of imported foreign bauxite. That condition as far as we are concerned would still obtain today even if we did receive some temporary assurance that larger tonnages of bauxite could be moved from South America. This still would seem to me to be an inadequate guaranty that we could continue to count upon such movements over the next few years.

Without being a military strategist I can conceive of any number of vicissitudes which would make it extremely difficult to undertake the importation of the millions of tons of bauxite necessary to maintain the operation of the present North American aluminum system. Any consideration of this problem must include not only the United States but Canada. There are many thoughtful people who consider it quite possible that Russia might engage in a separate peace and that the consequence thereof would be to prolong this war on the part of the Allies by a great number of years. I, of course, have no way of knowing how much substance there may be in a premise of this sort.

However, any decision now made which would eliminate the construction and operation of those plants projected for the treatment of nonbauxitic aluminous metals and would cancel the rest of this program now in progress must, in my opinion, be predicated upon a series of optimistic assumptions and possibly a combination thereof. It must be assumed, it seems to me, that the war will be a short one or that even if it should continue for a number of years shipping would at all times be relatively so free that it would not impose any burden upon military operations to continue not only to import several million tons of bauxite a year from South America, but to increase rapidly the future rate of importation. These assumptions seem very hazardous to me, and if they should turn out to be wrong this country could easily be placed in a position of great jeopardy. It is a fact that we have already stripped the cream of the high-grade deposits from Arkansas and are continuing to strip them at an unparalleled rate. Each 12 months leaves this country's limited bauxite resources in a weaker condition.

It is a function of any process work, such as that under consideration, that it takes long periods of time to select and develop the means best suited to the solution of new technological problems, and from that point to the stage of commercial production requires further large periods of time. The whole program is now so timed that one has a right to assume that as our domestic bauxite deposits are being reduced we are preparing in a timely fashion to replace them with other raw materials as bauxite production declines. For example, 2½ years from now we

could be in a position to produce on a large commercial scale such alumina as we might need to support the present aluminum system even with substantially decreased domestic bauxite production.

This whole question of preparing for the self-sufficiency of raw material supply for the continental aluminum system has received very extensive consideration by large numbers of technical people, and I think it is fair to say that all of those individuals and groups are in agreement that the steps we are now taking are justifiable and in order and that they should, if anything, be extended. It is my own personal opinion that we have not gone far enough and that to be entirely safe we should add at least two or three more processes of promise to our program.

In conclusion, if we cancel out this program we can claim self-sufficiency for the aluminum system, undoubtedly the most vital metal system in the entire conduct of the war, only provided we assume either a short war or a far greater degree of shipping freedom than we have ever enjoyed in the past 2½ years. Both of these premises seem to me to be extremely hazardous and are not assumptions upon which we should dare to risk the possible outcome of this war. I feel this matter deeply and have therefore taken this opportunity to present my views, opposed as they are to the action of the P. E. C., and to present them as vigorously as possible. Naturally, I should be very glad to appear before the next meeting of the P. E. C. if you would deem this a suitable method of reopening this important question.

A. H. BUNKER,

Director, Aluminum-Magnesium Division.

Mr. Speaker, those of us, who, like Mr. Bunker, are aroused over the critical situation that exists with reference to aluminum, have made and are making every endeavor to secure favorable consideration of a program which will make us self-sufficient in this strategic material which is necessary to win the war. We do not want to be caught in a box again as we were when our foreign importations of rubber were cut off. The same policy, it seems to us, is being followed now with reference to aluminum as was followed in the rubber fiasco. If we continue to refuse to make our country self-sufficient in aluminum for war planes after 3 years of war we may be without aluminum just as we found ourselves without rubber. I call attention to the following further facts with reference to this important problem, covering in some detail the various factors involved:

ALUMINA FROM NONBAUXITIC MATERIALS

In the past, all aluminum metal has been made from high grade bauxite, principally from Dutch and British Guiana, and to a lesser extent, from Arkansas. U-boat sinkings in the Caribbean and shortage of convoys and ships have forced the use of Arkansas bauxite almost to the exclusion, at times, of South American bauxite.

There are practically no known bauxite reserves in the United States outside the State of Arkansas, where they are estimated as follows:

Grade	Tons
High grade (under 8 percent silica).....	6,500,000
Medium grade (8-12 percent silica).....	10,000,000
Low grade (12-16 percent silica).....	11,000,000

The medium and low grade bauxite require special and nonstandard treatment, the effectiveness of which has not as yet been demonstrated. It is generally conceded, however, that a sufficient portion of the medium grade bauxite will lend itself to successful treatment so as to make a possible but not

certain maximum total reserve of only from 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 tons suitable and available for the aluminum industry.

Total bauxite requirements for the United States are approximately 5,000,000 tons per year. Any consideration of this problem should include not only the United States but Canada whose requirements amount to an additional 2,000,000 tons per year.

With the advent of the war it became apparent that these reserves were inadequate to bear the full weight of a long and difficult war, and subsequently with importations from South America being not only threatened but at times practically stopped by enemy submarines and shortage of ships, it likewise became apparent that steps should be taken to develop a substitute for bauxite and thus render the country entirely self-sufficient in supplying all of its alumina from domestic nonbauxitic materials which are known to be extremely abundant.

Immediately prior to this war, total alumina production capacity in the United States was approximately 400,000 tons per year, all produced by the Aluminum Company of America. This capacity has been or is being increased, mainly with Government funds, to approximately 2,500,000 tons, 93 percent of which is to be produced by the Aluminum Company of America. All of these facilities require bauxite, either foreign or domestic, for base material.

Immediately prior to this war total aluminum metal production capacity in the United States was approximately 400,000,000 pounds per year. This capacity has been or is being increased, largely with Government funds, to approximately 2,400,000,000 pounds, 93 percent of which is to be produced by the Aluminum Co. of America.

For many years a great deal of time and money has been spent by Federal and State agencies and by private industry in an effort to develop a process, or processes, for the extraction of alumina from nonbauxitic domestic materials, i. e., mine tailings, alunite, clays, and many other available aluminous materials. About 2 years ago the War Production Board enlisted the help of the National Academy of Sciences, who formed a special alumina committee to devote itself to this problem. This work involved an examination of some 50 or 60 processes, recommendations and suggestions for improving processes, pilot plant work under the direction of the War Metallurgy Committee largely at Government expense, and encouraging corporations not then engaged to enter into research and pilot plant work on nonbauxitic materials.

Of the various processes examined six or seven have been determined as being commercially feasible and worthy of demonstration with Government funds, and under Government supervision and direction. Five small experimental plants, all using different processes, two for the treatment of alunite, two for the treatment of clays, and one for the treatment of anorthosite, were recommended by the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board for construction, as follows:

1. Kalunite, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah, alumina from alunite.....	\$4,954,088
2. Aluminum, Inc., Marysville, Utah, alumina from alunite.....	775,000
	5,729,088
3. Columbia Metals, Pacific Northwest, alumina from clay.....	4,086,500
4. Ancor Corporation, Harleyville, S. C., alumina from clay.....	2,642,000
	6,728,500
5. Monolith Midwest, Laramie, Wyo., alumina from anorthosite.....	3,965,000
Total.....	16,422,588

Nos. 1 is practically completed and is expected to go into production immediately.

No. 2 is proceeding with construction without interruption.

Nos. 3, 4, and 5 had been working on design and ordering of equipment for the past 60 to 90 days until the Production Executive Committee of the War Production Board recently recommended their cancellation.

Quoting from a recent letter from Mr. C. E. Wilson, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, and Chairman of the Production Executive Committee, to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY:

"You very properly raised the question as to our bauxite supply for future years of the war's prosecution, and I shall outline our estimate of the availability of this commodity. For the purpose of determining our bauxite requirements through the coming 5-year period, I have quite arbitrarily estimated that aluminum requirements in these years will approximate the same exceedingly high demand estimated for 1944, namely, approximately 3,000,000,000 pounds, thus assuming that aircraft production would continue through these 5 years in excess of 100,000 planes. Accordingly, we plan on taking from our Arkansas deposits 5,000,000 tons of bauxite in 1944, and a similar amount in 1945, thus not requiring the importation of any Surinam bauxite during the coming 2 years for our domestic alumina production. In 1946 it is estimated we would be compelled to resort to use of a limited amount of Surinam bauxite as supply of domestic bauxite was reduced. Accordingly, we estimate that in 1946 we would use between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 tons of domestic Arkansas bauxite, and 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 tons of Surinam bauxite in meeting our total estimated requirement of 5,000,000 tons in that year. In 1947 we estimate we would use 3,000,000 tons of Arkansas bauxite and 2,000,000 tons of Surinam bauxite; and in 1948, 2,000,000 tons of domestic and 3,000,000 tons Surinam."

Mr. Wilson assumes the availability of 18,500,000 tons of Arkansas bauxite as against the best estimates of not to exceed from 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 tons. He further assumes the availability and freedom of movement of shipping facilities to import 6,500,000 tons of bauxite from South America in 1946, 1947, and 1948. The first assumption is subject to serious challenge, based upon facts and information available. The second assumption presupposes a military condition that it would seem hardly wise to count on, but granting the availability and freedom of ships from enemy attack, would it not be safer if not actually cheaper to expand the alumina-from-nonbauxite-materials plants, whose practicability can have been demonstrated by that time?

Both of the above assumptions presuppose the termination of the war within 5 years, which seems reasonable but by no means certain. There are many thinking people who consider it quite possible that it may continue for many years. No one, of course, has any way of knowing whether this war will continue more than 1, 3, 5 or more years, but it would seem that the cost of the proposed alumina program now being held up—\$10,692,500—would be cheap insurance—less than four-tenths of a cent per pound of our annual aluminum requirements—as against such an eventuality. In this connection it can be fairly said that the present supply or oversupply of aluminum metal or of bauxite has no direct bearing upon the question of whether or not to proceed with the alumina-from-clay program. The program was not conceived with the idea that it would make any contribution to the supply of aluminum or alumina at this time, nor any substantial contribution for a year or more, and then only

in the event of the realization of such likely eventualities as to make it seem grossly improvident—witness the rubber situation—for the Nation not to have taken those precautionary measures to establish self-sufficiency for the aluminum industry.

Quoting further from Mr. Wilson's letter: "For the long pull, I believe there is unquestionably great merit in the determination of the feasibility of producing our own requirements of alumina from domestic materials, and particularly from clay, obviously because the latter material is in almost unlimited supply. The War Production Board's determination to refrain from allocating the material and labor for the above-mentioned pilot plants is based solely on the belief that the aluminum supply and requirements figures for the next 5 years are in good balance, and that therefore the expenditure of materials and labor for the pilot plants is not now warranted as a definite war requirement, desirable as is the objective of the United States ultimately being in position to supply a more substantial part of its raw materials for aluminum production from domestic sources."

There seems to be general agreement as to the merits of the program, but disagreement as to the proper time to do it. If the program is not carried out now it will either be done too late at greater expense and less effectiveness or not at all. The Government is presently equipped with all facilities including the best aggregation of technical talent that it could hope to assemble. The sponsors and engineers have prepared themselves at great expense and are ready to undertake the responsibility of carrying the program to a successful conclusion. Manpower and materials required are small by comparison with the over-all war requirements, and insignificant in relation to the consequences of a possible situation which the program is designed to avert. Moreover, why should we spend money, manpower, and materials for the construction of ships in anticipation of bringing raw materials from a foreign country when for lesser amounts of money, manpower, and materials we can demonstrate the practicability of utilizing our own abundant national resources and at the same time render ourselves capable of becoming self-sufficient in one of our most important industries? Furthermore, if at the present time any money, manpower, or materials are being spent for the construction of ships for the movement of large tonnages of bauxite from South America, those resources could be more wisely spent by diverting them to this program and thus obviate the necessity for the ships.

The record is clear and the facts are well known to those who are responsible for prosecuting the war effort. The program is recommended and endorsed by responsible and representative authorities. Abandonment of the program may involve the making of a grave mistake and will invite never-ending criticism of those responsible for its abandonment, the justice of which will be difficult if not impossible to determine. Conversely, approval of the program in light of the record and all the circumstances will receive popular and substantial endorsement as a well thought out and intelligent effort to protect the most vital industry of the Nation.

SOME REASONS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ALUMINA-FROM-CLAY PLANT IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

1. There is an abundance of suitable clays in the Pacific Northwest, the existence and character of which has been established by the Bureau of Mines and private interests at great expense.

2. There are five aluminum reduction plants in the Pacific Northwest with a production capacity of 600,000,000 pounds, and two in California with a capacity of 256,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year. This is over one-third of the total United States production.

3. There is a rolling mill at Spokane, Wash., with capacity to accommodate a substantial portion of the aluminum metal production.

4. Over half of the Nation's aircraft industry, principal user of aluminum, is located on the Pacific coast.

5. One million two hundred thousand tons of high-grade bauxite ore, or 600,000 tons of alumina are needed to supply the aluminum reduction plants in the Pacific Northwest involving tremendous water and rail transportation. At the present time, alumina is shipped by rail a distance of from 2,500 to 3,000 miles, much of which is made from Dutch or British Guiana bauxite, which in turn has to travel by water some 2,000 to 3,000 miles.

6. The Federal Government already has many millions of dollars invested in the aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest, and many more millions invested in the several hydroelectric projects which depend importantly upon the aluminum industry for a substantial portion of the generating capacity.

7. There are several suitable locations in the Pacific Northwest nearby the clay deposits and having adequate facilities, including manpower.

8. All of the reasons for the over-all alumina-from-non-bauxite-materials program are magnified in their importance when applied to the Pacific Northwest because of the greater distances involved and the ready accessibility to cheap power, raw materials, and market.

There is something over \$500,000,000 invested by the Government in the aluminum program, including power facilities, in the Pacific Northwest which may be seriously jeopardized if we fail to develop sources of raw material for the production of aluminum in the Northwest. Those of us who have fought through the years for the development of the natural resources in that great territory and for marshaling these resources in the work of winning the war are deeply concerned over this proposed program which will stymie our efforts, rob the Government of much of its investment, and spell doom for an immense industry in the post-war period. In fact, if we had not had this vast pool of hydroelectric power and the aluminum plants in the Columbia River area producing one-third of our aluminum for war we could not be meeting with the success we now are on every battlefield. This huge industry will fold up when raw material for alumina is cut off. I call to your attention also three editorials from the two leading local newspapers in my congressional district, which show the feeling in that territory against the canceling out of this aluminum program.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of September 25, 1943]

THE ALUMINA PLANT

It should be clear from the testimony of the War and Navy Departments in regard to the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers that our high command is not confident of quickly winding up the war. If it were, much more could be gained from leaving the fathers at

their jobs than in putting them into training camps.

This being the judgment of the high command—proved by their testimony on the fathers, whether or not they say it in so many words—what are we to think about the delay in establishing a Pacific Northwest plant for reclaiming alumina from our native clays? Such a plant, to cost \$4,000,000, has been approved by the War Production Board and the War Department. The War Manpower Commission meanwhile has held up the project because of an alleged manpower shortage—primarily, it is well known, because of the situation which existed at Boeing's.

But every reasonable person who has made any study whatever of the aluminum needs will realize that whether or not there is a manpower shortage, the question of the clay-reduction plant should hinge not upon the manpower situation but upon the probable length of the war. Which is to say that the bauxite deposits of Arkansas will not last long, and those of South America cannot be depended upon in case of an emergency or in case of success of the submarine campaign when it is revived. Consequently, if we are to fight a long war, nothing whatever should stand in the way of the clay plant. And since it is the admitted judgment of the Army and Navy that we may have to fight a long war, why the delay? The War Manpower Commission is endangering the Nation.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of September 30, 1943]

AN OBSTRUCTION OF THE WAR EFFORT

One of the most important war industries of the Nation and what may well become the most important industrial development in the entire Pacific Northwest—the Columbia Metals alumina-from-clay plant—is being held up by a theoretical shortage of manpower.

This plant has been approved by the Aluminum and Magnesium Division and the Mineral Resources Coordinating Committee of W. P. B., and by the War Department. The Defense Plant Corporation has signed contracts with Columbia Metals to operate the plant for the Government, and with Chemical Construction Corporation, which developed the process, as engineer-contractor. The alumina committee of the National Academy of Sciences has investigated and approved the process. Chemical Construction Corporation, a subsidiary of American Cyanamid Corporation, has proceeded with the design of the plant and the ordering of equipment under letters of intent from D. P. C., aggregating \$1,100,000, has applied for another \$1,000,000, and will apply for the balance of a \$4,000,000 cost of the plant by the end of the year. The Pacific Northwest alumina committee, made up of representatives of business and civic interests, labor and agriculture, from Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, has agreed to allow experts to locate the plant where it belongs; that is, where raw materials, transportation, water, power, housing, and labor conditions are best, and is working wholeheartedly together to get the plant started. Actual surveys by both chambers of commerce and Federal agencies have shown that the 300 construction men needed to build the plant and the 150 men needed to operate it are available, at least, at two strategic points in Oregon, points too far away from Portland to interfere in any way with existing war production plants. This plant can be taken to an available labor supply and would actually add to rather than subtract from the war production labor supply of the region, which, while having an admitted over-all shortage of manpower, has areas in which an actual surplus of labor exists, one that can-

not be utilized effectively unless a plant is set up near it.

This alumina-from-clay plant, designed to permit ready duplication of units, can prove and make available for the war effort at least 100,000,000 tons of aluminous clay in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. It can become the means of making us independent of far-away foreign bauxite, and supplement the almost exhausted domestic supply. It can feed aluminum to hungry Pacific coast warplane plants, and become the center of a new chemical industry. It can be built and in operation in less than a year, if it is started immediately. It should be started immediately. Precious months have already been lost. Further delay, more especially a delay based upon the assumption of a labor shortage that does not exist so far as this plant is concerned, is inexcusable. It represents actual obstruction, either witting or unwitting, of the Nation's war effort.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of October 4, 1943]

THE ALUMINA FIGHT

When the War Production Board this week reviews the application of Columbia Metals Corporation for permission to establish in Oregon or Washington a small plant to produce alumina from native clays, it will may admit as evidence the news that Germany's submarine packs again are prowling the sea lanes, bearing new and vastly more destructive torpedoes. More lives may be lost in the sinking of one ship—a vessel which may be bringing bauxite from Dutch Guiana to the United States—than are required to build or to operate an alumina reduction plant.

The new Pacific Northwest alumina committee, in the last 10 days, has done a magnificent job on short notice of hammering home to the W. P. B., to McNutt's project-blocking Manpower Commission, and to Congress these primary facts: (1) The war is not over; (2) aluminum is needed in ever greater quantities to win the war; (3) renewal of Nazi submarine warfare shows the suicidal folly of our dependence upon bauxite ore shipped from Dutch Guiana; (4) the domestic supply of bauxite, in Arkansas, is sufficient to last only 1½ or 2 years if foreign imports are cut off.

This is a practical view of the alumina situation which rightfully subordinates the long-time need of the western light metals industry for an ore supply adjacent to the pig metal plants and rolling mills. The regional view on this matter has been adopted wholeheartedly by the northwest aluminum committee, on which are represented the chambers of commerce of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho (with one exception), the granges, labor, industry, and civic groups. This committee has swept away sectional considerations, espouses no one site, demands only that northwest clays be developed by an approved process for the northwest aluminum industry.

The only community which appears to be out of step with the rest of the region is Spokane, which has benefited most from the northwest's aluminum boom by acquisition of a reduction plant and a tremendously large fabricating mill. In recent statements published by Spokane newspapers, an ex-State senator and the president of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce have hinted at a plot to locate the alumina plant on the coast and seen a threat to the light metals capital of the West.

The astonishing proposal emanating from Spokane is that the fight for an alumina-from-clay plant be abandoned and that instead authorization be sought for a plant at Pasco to produce alumina from bauxite shipped from Dutch Guiana.

No one familiar with this region's lusty aluminum baby will oppose an alumina-from-bauxite plant either now or as a post-war project. After the war we will need both a bauxite and a clay development to keep our great aluminum plants operating against eastern competition. What Spokane's spokesmen do not seem to realize is that the clay plant is an immediate, a pressing war requirement. It is also a test for regional strength.

The only reason so far advanced at Washington, D. C., in objection to construction of the clay plant comes from the War Manpower Commission. It is that of a regional labor shortage. The argument has been thoroughly exploded. Construction of the plant would require 300 men, starting in about 6 months. Operation would need but 150 men, some of them skilled chemical workers brought from the East. Manpower Commission directors of Washington and Oregon have already certified that these needs could be met without tapping any war industry by selecting a site in Longview, Canby, Eugene, or several other communities.

The Spokane sectionalists who decry a sectional plot should realize that if the region is beaten in this effort to obtain an alumina-from-clay plant it might as well put aside any hope of obtaining other new war industries, possibly including a bauxite plant. And no one knows what difficulties will arise if we wait until the war ends before taking steps to protect and preserve the industries we already have.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the memorandum to which I have referred—that of Mr. Bunker under date of September 3—I call attention to another memorandum of October 5, giving additional data with reference to the alumina situation:

OCTOBER 5, 1943.

MEMORANDUM

To Mr. C. E. Wilson.
From A. H. Bunker.
Subject: Alumina and Aluminum Expansions.

I am listing below answers to a number of questions which you submitted to me last Saturday:

1. How much alumina capacity was planned?

In July 1941, the first aluminum expansion program took place. This provided for an alumina plant at Hurricane Creek, with an annual capacity of 1,000,000,000 pounds a year, to be operated by the Aluminum Co. of America. It also provided for the privately owned plant of Alcoa at Mobile, Ala., to be expanded by 320,000,000 pounds a year. This expansion was paid for with private funds. As incidental alumina facilities, we provided for an alumina-from-aluminate plant at Salt Lake City under the operation of Kalumite, Inc. This plant was to have a capacity of 72,000,000 pounds a year.

The second alumina expansion took place in February 1942. This provided for increasing the plant at Hurricane Creek from 1,000,000,000 to 1,300,000,000 pounds a year and the construction of a new Government-owned plant at Baton Rouge with a capacity of 1,000,000,000 pounds a year, to be operated by Alcoa.

In March 1943 the plant at Hurricane Creek was further increased by 255,000,000 pounds a year. This was made necessary by the fact that the reduction plants had demonstrated that they could produce more aluminum metal than they had been planned for. The Government alumina plants had capacities therefore of 2,555,000,000 pounds. The Mobile plant, as above stated, expanded by 320,000,000 pounds. The total of these expansions was 2,875,000,000 pounds.

In 1941 Reynolds Metals Co. completed the construction of an alumina plant having a capacity of 200,000,000 pounds. While this was a privately owned plant, the funds for the same had been borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In addition, there exist the privately owned plants of the Aluminum Co., one at Mobile with a total capacity, including the expansion indicated above, of 1,300,000,000 pounds a year, and one at East St. Louis with an annual capacity of 800,000,000 pounds a year. The total capacity of both Government-owned and privately owned plants using the Bayer process is therefore 4,855,000,000 pounds.

2. You have asked who was to produce the alumina and where. All this information is contained under No. 1.

3. How much of this capacity is now in operation?

The privately owned plants of the Aluminum Co. at Mobile and East St. Louis and the Reynolds Metals Co. at Listerhill are all running at full-planned capacity. The Government-owned plant at Hurricane Creek is now running at the full capacity of the first planned expansion, including the first 300,000,000-pound addition. The last expansion of 255,000,000 pounds has not been brought into production. The Government-owned plant at Baton Rouge is running at an annual capacity rate of 800,000,000 pounds, or 80 percent of its ultimate planned capacity. It is estimated that its full capacity rate will be achieved by December 1943. There is no question that all of these facilities will operate at 100 percent of their planned capacities.

4. How much aluminum capacity has been planned by the Government?

The first aluminum expansion provided for 7 plants, 1 to be operated by the Olin Corporation at Tacoma, Wash., with capacity of 41,500,000 pounds a year; 1 to be operated by Reynolds Metals Co. at Listerhill, Ala., with a capacity of 62,200,000 pounds a year, the former being Government financed, and the latter being privately financed, although through direct loans between that company and the R. F. C. In addition, arrangements were made for the construction of D. P. C. plants, to be operated by Alcoa. Following are the capacities of these plants:

	Pounds
Massena, N. Y.	96,000,000
Troutdale, Oreg.	96,000,000
Jones Mill, Ark.	128,000,000
Spokane, Wash.	64,000,000
Los Angeles, Calif.	128,000,000

Total 512,000,000

Total capacity of the above plants in the first expansion was 619,700,000 pounds. These plants later proved themselves to be capable of producing approximately 640,000,000 pounds a year.

The second aluminum expansion provided for increasing capacities of the Aluminum Co.-managed defense plants at—

	Pounds
Los Angeles	32,000,000
Spokane	128,000,000
Troutdale	32,000,000

Total increases of 192,000,000

In addition, plants were provided by D. P. C. to be managed by Alcoa at Burlington, N. J., with annual capacity of 96,000,000 pounds; at Queens, N. Y., with annual capacity of 256,000,000 pounds; and at Riverbank, Calif., with annual capacity of 96,000,000 pounds. The combination of increases and new plants represented an aggregate capacity of 640,000,000 pounds. These plants have since shown a capacity to increase their annual output by about 7 or 8 percent, or in the aggregate can probably produce about 40 or 50 million pounds more metal than originally planned for.

5. How many of these aluminum facilities are now operating at full-scale operation?

All of these aluminum facilities are running at full capacity, with the exception of two potlines at Los Angeles having an annual combined capacity of 64,000,000 pounds; and the one unit at Riverbank, Calif., which is not yet completed, has an annual capacity of 32,000,000 pounds.

6. What are the estimated requirements for alumina for 1944?

In order to run all of the aluminum facilities in the United States at full capacity, both Government owned and privately owned, there would be required 4,653,173,000 pounds of alumina. There would be required, in addition, for abrasives, chemicals, etc., 166,000,000 pounds; or total requirements would amount to 4,819,170,000 pounds.

It is doubtful whether this amount of alumina will be required, inasmuch as the consumption of aluminum by the various military agencies is not as great as that which they estimated. Large amounts of aluminum metal have already been made available for stockpile purposes, and it appears that at the present rate of production, including imports from Canada, aluminum metal may accumulate beyond the consumption rate, at around 25 or 30 million pounds a month. In view of this, and in view of the serious labor conditions on the west coast, it has been decided at least on a temporary basis, not to undertake the operation of the two remaining potlines at Los Angeles. If metal continues to be produced at a rate substantially in excess of consumption, it is anticipated that after accumulating a reserve stockpile of 250,000,000 pounds, operations will be reduced so that production will be brought in line with consumption.

7. What are the plant costs?

Alumina	
East St. Louis, Ill.:	
Bayer	Privately financed
Lime-soda-sinter	\$9,300,000
Mobile, Ala.:	
Bayer	Privately financed
Lime-soda-sinter	\$12,393,000
Hurricane Creek, Ark.:	
Bayer, original	16,480,000
First expansion	2,725,000
Second expansion	4,500,000
Lime-soda-sinter	10,340,000
Baton Rouge, La.:	
Bayer	15,900,000
Lime-soda-sinter	10,421,000

Aluminum ingot	
Burlington, N. J.	\$12,080,000
Los Angeles	21,788,000
Queens, N. Y.	34,657,000
Riverbank, Calif.	12,754,000
Spokane, Wash.	23,847,000
Troutdale, Oreg.	17,968,000
Jones Mill, Ark.	27,680,000
Massena, N. Y.	16,791,000

8. Why did we plan an alumina expansion of 600,000,000 pounds capacity and 2 months later cancel this planned capacity?

The Canadian Government requested permission to increase their alumina and aluminum facilities in Canada by a sufficient amount to increase their metal production by 180,000,000 pounds of aluminum a year. This would have required 360,000,000 pounds of alumina. The material coordinating committee decided that it would be unwise to create these facilities in Canada owing to the long hauls required for bauxite and the potential limitations of electric power, and agreed that the United States would undertake to supply the United Kingdom with this amount if it proved to be necessary.

An examination of the combined military requirements of the United Nations indicated that aluminum requirements would be approximately 4,400,000,000 and that alumi-

num supply would be approximately 4,400,000,000. It was evident that if these requirements were to be met there should be provided some margin of safety. There was, however, some doubt surrounding the overall requirements as stated by the various military agencies.

Inasmuch as it requires about twice as much time to construct alumina facilities as it does to construct reduction plants, it was decided to proceed with plans for additional alumina facilities in the amount of 600,000,000 pounds, and to later on determine whether it would be necessary to provide reduction plants.

A new review of all military requirements for aluminum was again undertaken and 2 months after the decision had been made to increase the alumina facilities, the P. E. C., representing the Army, the Navy, and the W. P. B., was able to reach a conclusion that the over-all requirements of the Allied Nations had been overstated and that it would not be necessary to provide any aluminum capacity above that which was already under construction. The 600,000,000 pounds of facilities had only reached the drawing board stage, and, therefore, the cancellation of these facilities presented no problem.

9. You have asked what the estimated costs of the 6 alumina-from-clay plants are.

There are only 5 plants which have so far been projected for the treatment of non-bauxitic materials; only 2 of these are for the treatment of clays; 2 are for the treatment of alunite; and 1 for the treatment of anorthosite. The companies and costs are listed below:

1. Kalunite, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah, alumina-from-alunite	\$4,954,088
2. Ancor Corp., Harleyville, S. C., alumina-from-clay	2,642,000
3. Aluminum, Inc., Marysville, Utah, alumina-from-alunite	775,000
4. Columbia Metals, Pacific Northwest, alumina-from-clay	4,086,500
5. Monolith Portland Midwest Co., Laramie, Wyo., alumina-from-anorthosite	3,965,000

A. H. BUNKER,

Director, Aluminum and Magnesium Division.

Mr. Speaker, I only received this copy of Mr. Bunker's second memorandum to Mr. Wilson from Mr. Wilson yesterday, and my colleagues and I have not had an opportunity to examine the factual and statistical data set forth, and therefore I am not in a position at this time to discuss the merits of the contentions made therein, but I do feel that it is proper that this data be made available for study by you, my colleagues, who are so greatly interested in this critical problem.

Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely hope that every Member of the Congress and every Federal official responsible for carrying out the war program will give attention to this serious problem facing us, which may mean the winning or the losing of the war. At the end of 3 years must we be at the mercy of foreign powers for airplane material? We all know the appeal that came from General MacArthur in Corregidor for airplanes, and every American had to turn his face in shame when he realized what took place in that great American outpost, where we had spent so many millions, where that great soldier, General MacArthur, and his courageous band were called upon to defend American possessions with practically no air force and with no tools of war adequate for the occasion. The heroic fight they made without proper

war equipment has never been excelled. God grant that we may never be caught in such a box again. It was the first time we have ever hauled down the Stars and Stripes at the demand of an enemy. May we not pray that those in charge of our aluminum program will not be called upon later to justify a position taken now which will deprive us of the opportunity to secure aluminum with which to maintain supremacy in the air in the days ahead and to bring victory to our cause. That problem is the one we now face. It is your responsibility and my responsibility as Members of the Congress of the United States before it is too late to bring every resource we have to bear upon this problem to the end that we may not fail in providing airplanes for our fighting men, without which they cannot win. I plead with you, my colleagues, to urge upon the President, as Commander in Chief, and every official having jurisdiction over the aluminum program to approve this alumina-from-clay program to the end that we may become self-sufficient in aluminum for airplanes and not be made dependent on foreign sources after 3 short years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McKENZIE]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for 4 days, on account of official and personal business.

To Mr. McCORD, for Monday, October 18, on account of business.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 714. An act for the relief of the commissioned officers of the U. S. S. *St. Louis* during the Spanish-American War, May 18, 1898, to September 2, 1898; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 759. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooley; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 771. An act to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 862. An act for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 950. An act for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Gerald G. Woods; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel Margolin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1246. An act for the relief of Ervin S. Finley; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1255. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1282. An act for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1309. An act for the relief of Pan American Airway, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1315. An act providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1336. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1346. An act for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1347. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

S. 1348. An act to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1354. An act to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1382. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1386. An act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 123. An act to authorize a per capita payment of \$10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 304. An act for the relief of J. E. Martin;

H. R. 305. An act for the relief of Howard Morgan;

H. R. 693. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Jacob Welozin;

H. R. 1869. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson;

H. R. 2250. An act to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 23, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2649. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.," approved April 20, 1942; and

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 373. An act to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

848. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 23, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Boston Harbor, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 10, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

849. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period August 1, 1943, to September 30, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

850. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Office for Emergency Management, War Production Board, fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

851. A letter from the Acting Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting a copy of the personnel requirements of the War Production Board for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944, prepared in accordance with instructions of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

852. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Economic Stabilization for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

853. A letter from the Secretary, the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe, National Gallery of Art, transmitting copy of the report "Quarterly Estimate of

Personnel Requirements," called for by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget under Circular 421 dated May 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

854. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, transmitting two copies of a draft of a proposed bill regulating the commitment of insane persons to veterans, and other United States institutions and making applicable to Federal reservations certain State laws pertaining to administration of estates of decedents, guardianship of minors and insane persons, commitment of insane persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Pensions. H. R. 2350. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 767). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 547. A bill for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham; with amendment (Rept. No. 768). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2384. A bill for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin; with amendment (Rept. No. 769). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3064. A bill for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; with amendment (Rept. No. 770). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3098. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. H. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 771). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Thomas Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 772). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3299. A bill for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 773). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3329. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse; with amendment (Rept. No. 774). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3330. A bill for the relief of R. B. Walker Funeral Home; without amendment (Rept. No. 775). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3331. A bill for the relief of Harry L. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3332. A bill for the relief of Spencer

Meeks; without amendment (Rept. No. 777). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 3448. A bill to provide an appropriation for the construction of the barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico authorized in Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress, for the purpose of connecting the intracoastal waterways of the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic seaboard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3449. A bill to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 3450. A bill relating to continuing the debtor in possession in certain reorganizations under the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 3451. A bill to provide for a jury trial with respect to the value of property condemned for certain flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3452. A bill to amend article 61 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3453. A bill to provide for a jury trial with respect to the value of property condemned for certain flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3454. A bill relating to overtime compensation prior to December 1, 1942, of certain per annum employees of the field services of the Department of War, the Panama Canal, the Department of the Navy, and the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3455. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a "T" tunnel as a means of communication and transportation between San Pedro, Wilmington, and Terminal Island, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3456. A bill to provide that retired Justices may serve on the Supreme Court of the United States when a quorum cannot be obtained because of the voluntary disqualification of one or more active Justices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3457. A bill to provide that the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 and the act of December 22, 1942, increasing the pay and allowances of Army and Navy nurses, shall take effect as of December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 3458. A bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3459. A bill to authorize war bonus at time of discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3460. A bill to provide vocational training and college educations for veterans of the Second World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ARNOLD:

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the tenure of office of President and Vice President and Members of Congress to 6 years, and imposing certain limitations on the appointment or election of certain persons to office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution to enable soldiers to vote by proxy; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 3461. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy Mulcahy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'ALESSANDRO:

H. R. 3462. A bill for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Bertha Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 3463. A bill for the relief of Donna May McNulty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3464. A bill for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3465. A bill for the relief of Archie Berberian, Kurken Berberian, and Mrs. Osetel Berberian; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 3466. A bill for the relief of the Mauer Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of Miss Anne Watt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 3468. A bill for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 3469. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John E. McNellis; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3470. A bill for the relief of Maj. William T. Owens; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2877. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of J. M. Galliot, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2878. Also, petition of Charles Lully, of Washington, D. C., and 16 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2879. Also, petition of Julius Lully, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2880. Also, petition of Charles A. Reed, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2881. Also, petition of Dorothy Throckmorton, of Washington, D. C., and 18 other citizens, protesting against the passage of

House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2882. Also, petition of Lillian Newson and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2883. Also, petition of Mrs. Fred Husmann and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2884. Also, petition of John D. Husing and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2885. Also, petition of Mrs. L. Mandeville and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2886. Also, petition of the Oberjuege Rubber Distributing Co., signed by five St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2837. Also, petition of the Ace Pattern Co. and signed by 15 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2883. Also, petition of John Rugger and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2889. Also, petition of Robert H. Brady and 24 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2890. Also, petition of H. Willenbrock and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2891. Also, petition of Joseph H. Buckholz and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2892. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of J. M. Sloan and others of Dubuque, Iowa, protesting against enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2893. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Neal D. Ireland and others, on the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2894. Also, petition of Jesse L. Luthi and others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2895. Also, petition of Rev. Robert B. Munger and others, favoring the passage of House bill 2082 prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2896. Also, petition of Ida Young and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2897. Also, petition of Florence A. Babcock and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termina-

tion of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2898. Also, petition of R. R. Detweiler and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2899. Also, petition of Rev. Lowell C. Wendt and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2900. Also, petition of R. E. Rose and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2901. Also, petition of Rev. Robert E. Cordell and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2902. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition of residents of Ulster, Greene, and Columbia Counties, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2903. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Rev. James M. Dooley, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 31 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2904. Also, petition of William F. Woodard, of Pomona, Calif., and 39 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2905. Also, petition of Dr. C. E. Britton, of Alhambra, Calif., and 257 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2906. Also, petition of Alice Meyers, of Alhambra, Calif., and eight others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2907. Also, petition of Gladys M. Jessup, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2908. Also, petition of Mrs. Daisy W. Howard, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2909. Also, petition of H. C. Scott, of Alhambra, Calif., and 12 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2910. Also, petition of Mary B. Sanborn, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2911. Also, petition of Mrs. H. S. Whiteman, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2912. Also, petition of Ida Belle Lenhart, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2913. Also, petition of Gordon W. McGreeley, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2914. Also, petition of Gladys P. Fellows, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2915. Also, petition of Mrs. Oliver Wilson, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2916. Also, petition of Everett Ventrees, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2917. Also, petition of John S. Phelps, of Glendora, Calif., and 14 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2918. Also, petition of Edwin G. Sweet, of Glendora, Calif., and 11 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2919. Also, petition of Emma G. Wiff, of Glendora, Calif., and 11 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2920. Also, petition of Florence Nicholson, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 42 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2921. Also, petition of Mrs. J. M. Pearson, of Rosemead, Calif., and 14 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2922. Also, petition of Myrtle Farrar, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 17 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2923. Also, petition of Rev. J. Harvey Deere, of Alhambra, Calif., and 118 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2924. Also, petition of George T. Counts, of Altadena, Calif., and 19 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2925. Also, petition of Mabel L. K. Shireman, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2926. Also, petition of Sue TerMoot, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2927. Also, petition of Sydney E. Boyd, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2928. Also, petition of Saidee L. Culver, of Pomona, Calif., and 20 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2929. Also, petition of Etta Dunlap, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 30 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2930. Also, petition of Lottie E. Neher, of La Verne, Calif., and 284 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2931. Also, petition of Gertrude M. Reitz, of Monrovia, Calif., and 14 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2932. Also, petition of Mrs. Abbie Helms, of Whittier, Calif., and 39 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2933. Also, petition of Margaret I. Sheffey, and 52 others, of Whittier, Calif., urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2934. Also, petition of Mrs. Ivy C. Newland, of Wilmar, Calif., and 18 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2935. Also, petition of Laura M. Sanders, of Glendora, Calif., and 33 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2936. Also, petition of Margery E. Van Derpoel, of Wilmar, Calif., and 18 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2937. Also, petition of Ruth E. Lutz, of Wilmar, Calif., and 18 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2938. Also, petition of Beatrice M. Lohger, of Whittier, Calif., and 15 others, urging pas-

sage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2939. Also, petition of Lillian K. Church, of Whittier, Calif., and 12 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2940. Also, petition of Harriet B. Pyle, of Whittier, Calif., and 34 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2941. Also, petition of Arthur J. Morris, of Whittier, Calif., and 34 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2942. Also, petition of Rev. Galen K. Walker, of Glendora, Calif., and 53 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2943. Also, petition of Mrs. James F. Noble, of Alhambra, Calif., and 15 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2944. Also, petition of Shirley V. Tomkins, of Alhambra, Calif., and five others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2945. Also, petition of Miriam T. Knight, of Pasadena, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2946. Also, petition of R. J. Flanders, of Whittier, Calif., and 77 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2947. Also, petition of Olive A. Fitzgerald, of Whittier, Calif., and 36 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2948. Also, petition of Charles E. Johnson, of Whittier, Calif., and 28 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2949. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. A. M. Bell, of Whittier, Calif., and 33 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2950. Also, petition of Arline Lewis, of Glendora, Calif., and 43 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2951. Also, petition of Caroline L. Stone, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2952. Also, petition of Mrs. Wayne Hyde, of Whittier, Calif., and 21 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2953. Also, petition of Bernard Beck, of Montebello, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2954. By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of Rev. Loy Snow and 42 other citizens of Terre Haute, Ind., urging Congress to pass House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2955. Also, petition of A. L. Watt and 76 other citizens of Hamilton County, Ind., urging Congress to pass House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2956. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., requesting the enactment of House bill 2082, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2957. By Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON: Petition with 1,151 signatures of citizens of the Fourteenth Congressional District, protesting against the moral and liquor conditions

around the Army camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2958. By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Sarah E. Eilsworth, Mrs. Charles Decker, and 193 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2959. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Joe Tessey, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 238 other citizens of Aberdeen, Hoquiam, and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2960. Also, petition of Peter Scure, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 119 other citizens of Aberdeen, Hoquiam, and vicinity, protesting passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2961. Also, petition of Christine Clark, of Hoquiam, Wash., and 119 other citizens of Hoquiam, Aberdeen, and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2962. Also, petition of D. N. Haydon, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 149 other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2963. Also, petition of J. K. Sundstrom, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 189 other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2964. Also, petition of J. C. Withrow, of Cosmopolis, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Cosmopolis and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2965. Also, petition of Burton Taylor, of Hoquiam, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Hoquiam and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2966. Also, petition of J. E. Owen, of Raymond, Wash., and 117 other citizens of Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2967. Also, petition of W. G. Shumway, Raymond, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2968. Also, petition of Peter P. Perry, Raymond, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2969. Also, petition of Marius Eaton, Elma, Wash., and 83 other citizens of Elma and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2970. Also, petition of L. E. Jensen, Raymond, Wash., and 25 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2971. Also, petition of Ray Nouska, Aberdeen, Wash., and 119 other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2972. Also, petition of D. I. George, McCleary, Wash., and 29 other citizens of McCleary and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2973. Also, petition of Rachel Miller, Raymond, Wash., and 16 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2974. Also, petition of Russell McCurdy, South Bend, Wash., and 29 other citizens of South Bend and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2975. Also, petition of Earl Biggs, Raymond, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2976. Also, petition of Perry G. McGee, Montesano, Wash., and 58 other citizens of Montesano and vicinity protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860 or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2977. Also, petition of J. C. Winten, Montesano, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Montesano and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2978. Also, petition of W. E. Burkinshaw, Aberdeen, Wash., and 89 other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2979. Also, petition of L. L. Swaney, Bucoda, Wash., and 29 others protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2980. Also, petition of Fred Dreblis, Centralia, Wash., and 59 others protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2981. Also, petition of T. Watson Ross, Shelton, Wash., and 29 others protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2982. Also, petition of W. B. Needham, Olympia, Wash., and 29 others, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860 or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2983. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petition of Society for Christian Service, First Methodist Church of Oneonta, N. Y., and 61 signers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2984. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Robinson's Tavern, Mokena, Ill., and 21 signers, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2985. By the SPEAKER: Petition of city and county clerk of the city and county of Honolulu, Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending the immigration and naturalization laws so as to permit entry of Chinese into the United States and to grant them citizenship privileges; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2986. Also, petition of pastor, the Harlem Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Finnish-American Trade Union Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Wiley J. Ferguson, of Wesson, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the manifold blessings which Thou hast bestowed upon this great Nation. We are grateful for the ideals and benefits of the Christian democracy which we enjoy.

We come with humble hearts into Thy holy presence at this hour, O Father of all mercy, and pray that Thou wilt guide the Members of the Senate in the discharge of their duties.

Bless all the nations of the world and hasten the day when we shall have peace

in keeping with Thy divine will. With faith in Thee we herald the coming of the new day of brotherhood throughout the world.

In this critical hour of the world's history we need Thee and the guidance which Thou alone canst give, O God of truth and justice and love and peace.

God be merciful unto us and bless us and cause His face to shine upon us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, October 14, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 128. An act to authorize a per capita payment of \$10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 304. An act for the relief of J. E. Martin;

H. R. 305. An act for the relief of Howard Morgan;

H. R. 693. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Jacob Wolozin;

H. R. 1869. An act authorizing the President to present in the name of Congress a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson;

H. R. 2250. An act to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2649. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.," approved April 20, 1942; and

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Danaher	Langer
Andrews	Davis	Lucas
Bailey	Downey	McCarran
Ball	Ellender	McClellan
Bankhead	Ferguson	McFarland
Barbour	George	McKellar
Bilbo	Gerry	McNary
Bridges	Gillette	Maloney
Brooks	Green	Maybank
Buck	Guffey	Mead
Burton	Gurney	Millikin
Bushfield	Hatch	Murdock
Butler	Hayden	Murray
Capper	Hill	Nye
Caraway	Holman	O'Daniel
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	Overton
Clark, Mo.	Kilgore	Pepper

Radcliffe	Taft	Wagner
Reed	Thomas, Idaho	Walsh
Reynolds	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Russell	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Scrugham	Tunnell	White
Shipstead	Tydings	Wiley
Smith	Vandenberg	Willis
Stewart	Van Nuys	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER] are absent attending the funeral of the late Representative Creal, of Kentucky.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13, where he is now recovering from virus pneumonia.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS EXCELLENCY, ELIE LESCOT, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, His Excellency, Elie Lescot, President of the Republic of Haiti, is in the Vice President's Chamber and is about to visit the Senate as its guest. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess in order to greet the President of Haiti and to hear his address. I further ask that the Vice President appoint a committee to escort him to the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair appoints the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] as the committee to greet the President of Haiti and escort him into the Chamber.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.,

His Excellency, Elie Lescot, President of the Republic of Haiti, escorted by the